

**THE AMBITIONS AND AMBIGUITIES OF COMMUNITY:
STATE POLICY AND ARTISAN COOPERATION IN RURAL PERU**

By

Jennifer A. Vogt

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Anthropology

December, 2013

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Edward F. Fischer, Ph.D.

Lesley Gill, Ph.D.

Brian Heuser, Ed.D.

John W. Janusek, Ph.D.

To my family, who encouraged me to be perpetually curious.

To my family, who has shown infallible patience and support for my aspirations.

To my family, who inspires me to care for myself and for others.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My dissertation committee members for their time, patience, and comments,

Edward F. Fischer, Director of the Center for Latin American Studies and Professor of Anthropology, Vanderbilt University for encouraging me to do this research, for being a pragmatic and supportive advisor and for reading drafts at the last minute,

Juan Chacaliaza, specialist of ceramic analysis, Universidad Nacional San Cristobol de Huamanga, and Efrain Quicaña, International Labor Organization, for their guidance and for the doors they opened for me in the field,

Gloria Suarez, Karina Barrientos, Ruth Barrientos and Jack Sanchez, for laughing and crying with me, for caring for and nourishing me like family during fieldwork,

The people of Quinua, Peru for sharing their stories, their homes, and their lives with me,

The Inter-American Foundation, Fulbright Hays, and Vanderbilt University for their funding and support during fieldwork, and the Robert Penn Warren Center, Vanderbilt University, for funding the write-up of this dissertation,

My fellow Robert Penn Warren Center colleagues who taught me a great deal about scholarly collaboration and support, especially Michael Alijewicz for much needed care and encouragement in the final stages of writing,

Monte Hendrickson, Danielle Kurin, and David Guy for helping me through those moments of doubt when I was deep in the “dissertation mud” of fieldwork and writing,

Anyone who ever gave me words of kindness, inspiration, and support throughout these past seven years of hard work and amazing life lessons.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
 Chapter	
1 Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	8
The “Social Life” of Neoliberal Reform.....	9
Anthropology, Artisans, and Craft Production	13
Development Paradigms	19
The Collision and Confluence of Development Models with Local Artisans	25
Analytical Approach	31
Layout of the Dissertation.....	35
2 Quinoa in National and Global Craft Markets.....	43
Ceramic Producers in the Local Setting.....	43
The District of Quinoa	47
<i>Mi comunidad</i> : The Political Economy of Community in Quinoa	54
Current Dynamics Underpinning Ceramic Production Today.....	57
The Political Economy of Craftwork: Historical Foundations in Ayacucho	68
Craftwork in Twentieth Century Peru.....	75
Recent History of Craftwork in Quinoa.....	78
Present-day Political Economy and Craftwork in the District of Quinoa.....	87
Economic and Political downturn: Widespread Transformations	89
Concluding Remarks.....	93
3 Business Associations.....	95
The Moral and Political Dynamics	95
Policy Work	102
Local Realities	111
Contradictions and Negotiation	125
Concluding Remarks.....	128
4 A World of Difference.....	130
Imitation, Conventionality, and Authenticity	130

Doppelgangers at the Market	132
Multiple Significations.....	142
Personal Imprints: Producer Narratives	145
Social Commitment and Values of Personal Authenticity	147
“You May Copy Me, but You Will Never Equal Me.”	150
Plaster molds, Plaster Artisans.....	154
 5 Conclusion	 160
Making Connections	162
Contributions	169
 REFERENCES	 177

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

On July 9, 2011, one of the many afternoons I sat shivering in the dry cold of his workshop, Roberto Gutierrez described his life's work in ceramics. "I have eight children... The older ones are in Lima, working as mechanics... When they lived here they learned ceramics from me, but they finished their studies and went to Lima because these days ceramics doesn't give young people secure work." Roberto was one of over a hundred producers I had spoken to for my research conducted in the rural district of Quinua, Peru. Like Roberto, every producer told stories of being poorly paid. Many expressed concern that more and more young people were migrating to cities, while others conveyed guarded optimism that their children could find work in urban areas. Roberto, like others, even held out some hope for the future of their craft heritage, musing at one point, "But maybe one of my children will continue my work. Who knows?"

Roberto went on. "My work isn't valued, not like in other businesses. For example, Mamerto Sanchez...he's an *artesano antiguo*...He makes good quality work that's highly recommended, and he's well known... People try to copy him, but it isn't the same." Again, Roberto's narrative reminded me of other artisans' accounts – stories of rival artisans, of styles copied and even stolen, of competitors devaluing others' work, and of a few master and "true" artisans making it big in the market. Roberto's portrayal of his vocation also recalls the stories of artisans told by other anthropologists, such as Rudi Colloredo-Mansfeld working with weavers in Ecuador and Michael Chibnik with woodcarvers in Mexico. I was, therefore, well

prepared to hear about the challenging and sobering experiences of craft production, even before I arrived in Quinua in October of 2010.

What came as a surprise, however, was the often contentious and problematic relationships of producers and their cooperative associations. As Roberto explained:

It's the lack of organization here, that's what's hurting us. ... I was in an association once... Do you know Faustino Huasacca? More than anyone in Quinua, he, and Tomas Cardenas, Cesar Orellana, they're like the authorities of the artisans here. They formed an association... But what do you think happened? They used the association's name, to go to fairs and export ceramics. We've given them designs too, each one of us, so they can take them to fairs. And they make an agreement with an exporter, who says, "I want this work... I want 5,000 pieces." Sometimes he might want 10,000 pieces. But it's the coordinators who make the pieces for the order and don't give it to us.

I first heard similar complaints when I started fieldwork, and at that time I assumed that they were isolated cases. I was determined not to overvalue the perspectives of a few eccentrics and local gossips. Based on the literature on artisan cooperatives in Latin America and elsewhere, I assumed that even if these collective efforts underwent their fair share of internal problems, most artisan producers would still see them as the best option for negotiating their stakes in global capitalist markets. During my months in Quinua, however, artisans revealed profound suspicions and reluctance towards the newly introduced, cooperative-like, business associations.

I learned about Quinua "business associations" for artisans in 2008 when the Peruvian State introduced a new initiative to promote small-scale producers under Law 29073 "*Ley del Artesano y del Desarrollo de la Actividad Artesanal* (Law of the Artisan and Development of Artisanal Activity). These associations employ a neoliberal vocabulary of entrepreneurship¹ to describe what is in practice a lot like cooperatives. Development economists introduced business associations (*asociacion empresarial*) in Quinua based on the general principal of associativity

¹ Words like efficiency, flexibility, location-competition, performance, and competitiveness have become part of an economic ideology of "entrepreneurship," receiving new meanings under the concept.

(*asociatividad*), defined as a mechanism of cooperation between small businesses where each business voluntarily decides to participate in a collective effort with other participants to look for a common objective while still maintaining juridical independence and managerial autonomy. Objectives usually include improving management, productivity and competitiveness in global markets (Inter-American Development Bank 2006). The most prominent forms of *asociatividad* in Peru are business associations, cooperatives, and consortiums, all of which function differently regarding rights and obligations of members, objectives, duration, complexity of management structure, and number of members.² Ostensibly, members of these associations in Peru are *micro empresas* (microbusinesses). In legal terms, *micro empresas* are production units composed of one to ten workers per year on average; in economic terms, they are joined by bonds of trust and mutual solidarity, which facilitate transactions between them and thus cut down on costs. In Quinoa, *micro empresas* usually consist of an individual ceramic producer, usually the male head of the household, who has setup a small family workshop in or near his home. Official development discourse refers to these individuals as *micro empresarios* (micro entrepreneurs).

As my fieldwork unfolded, and I became more involved in producers' lives, it became clear that the business associations were widely viewed with distrust based on pressures to join, lack of communication and transparency, fraudulent uses of designs, and embezzlement of development funds.³ Producers from different social groups – from more prominent to little known artisans – recounted, for instance, how one association won a grant to purchase materials and training courses

² For a comparison of associations, cooperatives, and consortium, see Programa Conjunto 2011.

³ To my knowledge, only one artisan cooperative was ever attempted in Quinoa. A few older artisans, now in their sixties, described how they helped organize a cooperative in the early 1970s among fifteen or so ceramicists, through which they collectively bought a truck to haul ceramics from Quinoa to Ayacucho and beyond. The cooperative disbanded reportedly due to divisive jealousies emerging between members.

to construct improved kilns. But some members, like Roberto, received incomplete kilns or no kiln at all. Even development workers told me stories about a few leaders keeping organization property in personal workshops, never allowing anyone to use it. So at the time of my interview with Roberto, after I had been working in Quinua for nine months, his experience articulated feelings held by artisans that had already coalesced around a common evaluation: “Associations don’t work for us.”

This dissertation unpacks what Roberto means by situating his claims in the artisan population in the Quinua community. I analyze how the ceramic artisans of Quinua influence, and are influenced by, recent state projects to encourage collective entrepreneurship while also supporting notions of cultural heritage and identity. I focus particular attention on two concrete practices – community-based business associations and intellectual property right (IPR) regimes – that enact official models of business ethics and development promoted in neoliberal policy agendas and international law. I ultimately argue that people in rural towns and villages are differently positioned to take advantage of the benefits of state-authorized development: accrual of development benefits depends on being perceived as well connected, an accomplished artisan, and having export market experience. Such reputation is not necessarily secured and reinforced by willing participation in community events, but rather by projecting one’s needs, aspirations, and relationships in the language of market and business culture. Some groups are privileged by this discourse while others are further marginalized. Artisans ultimately struggle to evaluate each other to define who ought to benefit from development projects, such as business associations and legal frameworks for property titling.

Since the 1980s neoliberal development policies have adopted a language of business in their projects, seeking to harness a presumed innate entrepreneurial spirit among the poor

through market expansion (see de Soto 1989, 2000).⁴ In the late 1990s/early 2000s, Latin American officials and politicians began to encourage the creation of new institutional frameworks that, according to current development models, create and foster the conditions for the mobilization of, and reliance on, local resources (e.g, artisanal technologies and skills, informal social networks for production, distinctive cultural symbols and practices). In 2007, for instance, Peru's Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism promulgated Law 29073 "*Ley del Artesano y del Desarrollo de la Actividad Artesanal* (Law of the Artisan and Development of Artisanal Activity)" to support autonomous artisan organizations and civic engagement of impoverished artisans. It is estimated that 1.8 million artisans in Peru rely on informal practices and relationships such as unpaid family labor or acquiring skills from friends, the majority of who reside in rural villages and towns like Quinoa (CIAP 2004). The new legal framework offers legal status to these "informal" producers and other market-oriented organizations, formally stated rights and responsibilities to conduct business, and a legally binding governance structure for securing cultural rights to local designs and techniques.

I show how local dynamics can subvert the intentions of these programs while simultaneously reinforcing the models on which they structured. I argue that these models obscure how local people regularly operate within the ambiguous interstices of heterogeneous forms of exchange and relationships. These dynamics include cooperation and exploitation, family and economy, friends and competitors, community-based exchange and formal market (Smart and Smart 2005:1; see also Narotzky 2008). Specifically, development policy promoted by state, NGOs, and international organizations in recent years – rather than recognizing contradictory bonding of dependency and distinction, of the personal and the collective –

⁴ In the post-WWII period, import substitution industrialization policies dominated, promoting development and classic dependency in Latin American countries (see).

primarily promotes the positive aspects of living in close proximity and of intimate, everyday interactions (e.g., cooperation, feelings of shared belonging, interdependence). These models thus overlook how local actors are also enmeshed in, and subject to often intense social networks with their own power relations. At the same time, as I further show, the model as promoted has at its base a methodological individualism. I ultimately argue that “community,” in its diverse usages and meanings for people on the ground, does not resemble the same egalitarian ideal promoted in development policy. This model is superimposed by deep and abiding obligations of family and community that have their own forms of exclusion and hierarchy. Rather than distributing agency, current neoliberal programs, I argue, actually accelerate this differentiation and incipient community class structure.

In this dissertation, I show how local people assume and seek particular kinds of relationships within specific development interventions that depend more heavily on informal, locally contextualized understandings and improvisations of how relationships and collaboration are built. Thus, rather than analyze business associations and IPRs as discreet projects, I am more concerned with capturing how local people build on and negotiate local cultural and social resources upon which business associations and IPRs rely, and further, how local tactics of deferral, absenteeism, accommodation and selective appropriation simultaneously run counter to and parallel the basic premises and intended functioning of these supposedly more human-centered and democratic normative frameworks. This approach to development builds on an understanding of intentional development intervention as developed by sociologist Norman Long and others (see Arce and Long 2000; Pigg 1992, 1993; Vincent 2012), who argue for apprehending the wider contexts of interventions, and to critically situate seemingly discreet projects within the continuous flow of social, political and economic life. Ultimately, local

people often incorporate development projects, and their attendant technologies, into their own projects of livelihood, that is, of making a living and making it meaningful (Bebbington 2000). Such accommodation can result in projects running counter to the objectives they were intended to accomplish.

In this dissertation, I examine how the top-down structures of business associations and IPRs intersect with local social dynamics among Quinoa potters in rural Peru. I argue that a tension exists between cooperation and competition, between the collective good and personal gain, that defines individual and community engagement with such new state development plans. In Quinoa, business associations offer new ways for improving commercialization and development as intended, but they also recycle some of the very processes of social exclusion (e.g., from access to information, markets, production resources, and bargaining power) that they purport to work against. Furthermore, artisans' struggles over aesthetic appreciation both validate and challenge authorized business models that encourage both market-savvy innovation and socially inclusive enterprise: on the one hand, artisans imitate and adapt more widely used, and often official, discourses of "authenticity," "creativity," and "tradition"; on the other, given intense feelings of competition amid markets pressures in the local setting, artisans in Quinoa do not see the benefits of such models accruing to everyone. A certain irony surrounds how new models adapt existing processes of exclusion, since the same social processes of exclusion that justify the creation of supposedly more equitable organizations are also the same forces that contribute to their creation. I thus show that traditional bonds of social obligation constrain the sort of economic growth individual producers experience, and that the most successful producers are those who are able to channel traditional reciprocal ties into business productivity. So what we find in Quinoa is that current development

models have become coopted by existing social hierarchies through traditional exclusionary forms of organization.

I proceed by reviewing the research concerning small-scale production systems in rural areas, comparing anthropological treatments of artisans and craft production to case studies and theories developed in the field of business and economics. I offer some general critiques that other chapters will expand on and contextualize. I then show how the two strands of research can be put into productive conversation, suggesting that development intervention in Quinoa should be put into dialogue with existing social inequalities.

Literature Review

Rural people have long drawn on both longstanding cultural traditions and novel forms of organization to preserve and strengthen their economic and cultural autonomy (Rahnema and Bawtree 1997; Nash 2000; Stephen 1991; Ziai 2007). State governments, however, particularly in Latin America, have only relatively recently begun to celebrate cultural differences and grassroots organizations to promote entrepreneurship and participation among the rural poor (Davis 2002; Healy 2001; Kleymeyer 1994). In the contemporary world of policymaking a key question is no longer “*Is* culture relevant?” but “*How* does culture matter?” This shift is remarkable given that neoliberal reform prior to the 2000s – involving liberalization of land markets and privatization of social enterprises – disrupted social relations of reciprocity and communal institutions (Garcia Canclini 1993; Gudeman 2008). In this dissertation, I show that external development models do indeed draw on and reinforce local practices and values systems through community-based projects. Producers and producer families take part in these projects in hopes of gaining prestige for artistic abilities in their local communities as well as an edge in

fickle international craft markets. I also show, however, that local social structures, like family networks and incipient community class relations, can subvert the intentions of these programs. Models, rather than strengthening community as they were intended, end up representing vehicles for individual and family advancement. I thus argue that rather than distributing any kind of agency for disadvantaged populations, current neoliberal policies that promote cultural heritage and identity actually accelerate differentiation between families, class, and gender.

The “Social Life” of Neoliberal Reform

In assessing the political and socio-cultural consequences of neoliberal policy reform, many studies within anthropology, political economy, and economic development have argued that an invigorated free market advanced under neoliberal reform celebrates competitive individualism (Gill 2000; Ong 2006; Sen 1999). It has encouraged loosening dependency on the state, labor unions, and communal institutions that once gave people a measure of social and economic security (Bebbington and Carroll 2000; Gudeman 2008; Leiva 1998; Schild 1998, 2000; Zermeño 1989; Winn 2004). Pressures to create land markets, particularly in rural Latin America, have removed land and other communal resources such as forms of reciprocity that are foundational to livelihood and community cohesion among poor people (Barkin 1990, 2001; Bartra 1993; Gudeman 1996; Plant 2002). As a result of a shrinking land base rural people throughout Latin America have intensified household craft production (W. Mitchell 1991; Nash 1993). The resulting tensions emerge in new social and discursive practices (such as competition, rumors of design theft, and signs of new inequalities) threaten the domestic and community relations in which such production is contained (Cohen and Browning 2007; Garcia-Canclini 1993; Nash 1993). To competitive, some artisans manipulate reciprocal ties to control

the labor (often women's and children's unpaid contributions) and earnings of family and friends (Cook 1984, 1993; Cook and Binford 1990; Nakatani 1999; Narotzky 2004; Stephen 1991; Wilkinson-Weber 1997). The burden of intensification of work, as in craft production, has not weighed equally on all, and increasing interdependence of household members has not taken place in a peaceful environment (Gwynne and Kay 1999 2000; de la Rocha and Escobar Latapí 2002). While global capital's expansion under neoliberal economics has allowed new scales of prosperity, productivity and efficiency to be achieved, so too has it generated unprecedented scales of wealth concentration, unbounded social and territorial displacement, the mass disenfranchisement of growing populations (Chase 2002; Comaroff and Comaroff 2001, 2005; Harvey 2006, 2007; Ong 2006; Sassen 1990, 1991, 2002; Tsing 2011).

Many studies have approached Peru as a prime example of widespread disintegration of communal institutions and organizations brought about by neoliberal policy reform (Cotler 1994; Tulchin and Bland 1994; Panfichi 1997). Since the 1980s, successive Peruvian administrations have drastically cut education and health services, dismantled associations created under the 1969 agrarian reform, decimated agricultural subsidies, and fostered inequality by liberalizing land markets (Manrique 1996; Williamson 1990; Yashar 2005). Even though agricultural output grew in the 1990s, more than 50 percent of the population lived below the poverty line (Gonzales de Olarte 1997). Further studies have linked economic reform with the dramatic violence in Peru in the 1980s to early 90s by Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path) and later government suppression (McCormick 1990; Seligmann 1995, 1998; Shifter 2006; Solfrini 2001; Stern 1998). Local membership associations, particularly indigenous organizations, were greatly weakened by guerilla forces and army suppression (Bebbington and Carroll 2000; Degregori 1998; McClintock 1989). Indeed, during these years, rural and indigenous communities in Peru

suffered along many dimensions, including devastating poverty levels (Psarcharopoulos and Patrinos 1994).

Anthropologists and other scholars have recently adopted more nuanced views revealing how new and changing cultural practices respond to and provide local alternatives to neoliberal landscapes—even as they incorporate market practices (Bebbington 2000; Bebbington and Carroll 2000; Burdick, Oxhorn, and Roberts 2009; Goldstein 2004; Gudeman and Rivera-Gutiérrez 1990, 2002; Nash 2001; Sawyer 2004). New neoliberal economic realities have generated new interactions, such as rising competition in markets for indigenous products, through which artisans renegotiate commitments to family and community (Cohen 1998, 1999, 2001; Colloredo-Mansfeld 1999, 2002; Korovkin 1997, 1998; Nash 2000). Artisans in Latin America and elsewhere have formed associations to more effectively negotiate their participation in global markets (Cohen 1998; Eber and Rosenbaum 1993; Ehlers 1993; Grimes and Milgram 2000; Healy 2001; Kovic and Eber 2003; Nash 1993a, 1993b; Stephen 2005; Tice 1995). These studies indicate that local collective enterprises, grounded in cultural practices, have been able to take advantage of new opportunities in commercial markets and globalization. These scholars still recognize the gravity of increasing inequalities in terms of power, wealth, and social status under neoliberal forms. Market-oriented development interventions thus indeed challenge, but do not prevent artisans from renegotiating shared practices and community commitments—even in working to navigate their stakes in global markets (Colloredo-Mansfeld and Antrosio 2009; Nash 1993; Stephen 2005). For anthropologists in particular, people may strategically cooperate in competitive contexts, market or otherwise, as they recognize the value of individual and others' well-being.

Ultimately, the same capitalist economic forces that make it necessary to tap these

multiple livelihood possibilities—not only to supplement wages but also as a hedge against the uncertainty that accompanies flexibility (Nash 1994)—are also the same forces that contribute to their creation (Creed 2001). These studies further highlight an important point about neoliberal intervention projects: issues of policy implementation should not be restricted to the study of top-down, planned programs by governments, development agencies and private institutions, since local groups actively formulate and pursue their own “projects” of development”, which may run parallel to, and perhaps also challenge, the goals of central authorities (Bebbington 2000, Long 2001).

Current neoliberal models for development thus cannot be understood without analyzing them in the context of social and discursive practices surrounding and shaping cooperative relations among populations and communities in the rural Andes. The principles guiding the creation and maintenance of these overlapping social relations are not simply those of economic efficiency but also of cultural criteria, social commitments, and personal aspirations (Colloredo-Mansfeld 2002; Van Vleet 2008). As market economies increasingly shift to include more flexible, localized strategies and social concerns, it becomes imperative to assess the multiple potentialities of local populations, so-called “subordinate” or “weaker” actors, to create personal and collective space and defend their diverse social commitments. Rural producer networks “targeted” by culturally sensitive reforms, while being promoted as essential to entrepreneurial networking and building flexible partnerships, are only one aspect of a complex system of social relations in which rural people are embedded.

Anthropology, Artisans and Craft Production

Generally, approaches to artisan production tend to fall in one of two camps, one that focuses on the moral base of economies and the other that focuses on the political dynamics. A handful of more recent studies, such as Colloredo-Mansfeld (1999), have reconciled these often distinct lines of scholarly inquiry. I combine these models because the complexity of social and economic dynamics in Quinua cannot be adequately explained employing either the political or moral economic model alone. My research intervenes where on-the-ground experiences meet more programmatic and externally derived development schemes. In fleshing out a subjective social reality, I show how anthropological theory and methods are essential to developing business and economic models. Specifically, I bring issues of power and inequality front and center while still maintaining a rigorous focus on the strength of communal organization and reciprocal relationships. Ultimately, artisans in Quinua, as in other countries in Latin America and Africa, Quinua artisans live in the sometimes aggressive tension between dependency and distinction. In the remainder of this section, I explore and lay out some of these ideas offered by other scholarly work on artisan production that I draw upon for the dissertation.

Potters in Quinua are among a wide variety of artisan producers who make objects for an expansive trade in what Nelson Graburn (1976) called “ethnic and tourist arts,” what Mirko Lauer (1982) called “plastic “, and what UNESCO calls “artisan products.” These commodities called “artisan products” are commonly characterized by the high level of manual labor and correspondingly low level of capital investment in high-technology production (Cook 1993). Although few scholars have focused on Quinua ceramics, anthropologists have productively examined how Otavalan weavers (Colloredo-Mansfeld 1999), Kuna *molas* makers (Tice 1995), and Oaxacan woodcarvers (Chibnik 2003) and a proliferating number of weavers, potters,

brickmakers, lacemakers, and tailors the world over are intimately connected to the kinds of commodity flows that help give shape to diverse and overlapping “regimes of value” and thus become inextricable from confluent “tournaments of value” (Appadurai 1986; see also Myers 2001). In the past four decades, too, anthropologists have written extensively about the culturally expressive nature of these objects, particularly in that producers incorporate aspects of ethnic or indigenous identity to make and market them (e.g., Garcia Canclini 1993; Marcus and Myers 1995; Nash 1993; Phillips and Steiner 1999). They have emphasized the political and economic ties between local communities and international populations, revealing the sorts of cultural representations, economic structures, and sociopolitical relations that shape these flows as well as transformations in commodities themselves.

Many of the early studies of craft production in Latin America provide important ethnographic descriptions of how crafts were made⁵ and made strides in identifying unequal relations between industrialized and the “underdeveloped” countries. The scholars writing these accounts in the 1960s through the early 1980s, however, did not address issues of class, gender, and ethnicity.⁶ Neither did they highlight how local populations and their communities were interconnected with the larger political economy (Wolf 1982). In the late 1980s, Wolf (1982) challenged scholars to show “the range and variety of such populations, of their modes of existence before European expansion and the advent of capitalism, and of the manner in which

⁵ Studies usually focused on single communities, with a few notable exceptions focusing on Otavalo and social change and showing the interrelationship between land ownership and craft production (Collier 1949; Salomon 1981[1973]). Although the 1960s were marked by a surge in the commercialization of indigenous crafts and the formation of craft cooperatives, largely through the efforts of the Peace Corps volunteers, anthropologists do not appear to have published studies on the effects of these projects and policy developments during this period.

⁶ Dependency theorists argued that Latin American countries were being actively underdeveloped and impoverished through the exploitation of raw materials and cheap labor (Frank 1966). When rural households were no longer able to subsist on agricultural production alone because of insufficient land, craft production and sales offered a supplementary source of livelihood (Sabogal Wiese 1978; Littlefield 1979; Garay Castillo and Medina Perez 1981). Households with land often combined agricultural and craft production, while landless households depended solely on income from artisan production (Sabogal Wiese 1978).

these modes were penetrated, subordinated, destroyed, or absorbed, first by the growing market and subsequently by industrial capitalism” (1982:23). This shift in focus marked an important turn in understanding the effects of increased production for sale of crafts on the work organization and social stratification of rural economies.

Taking up Wolf’s call to view the world as interlinked and to study these inter-linkages historically, anthropologists have offered compelling analyses of differentiation in particular villages and small towns (e.g., Cook and Binford 1990; Garcia Canclini 1993; Novelo 1976; Tice 1995). Commercialization of ethnic and tourist arts increased stratification as some artisans are more successful than others and local merchants place themselves between producers and consumers (e.g., Cook 1993; Garcia Canclini 1993; Littlefield 1979; Waterbury 1989). Increases in wealth and status stratification within communities has led to tensions among kin, friends, and neighbors that feed into declining community solidarity, gossip and unpleasant competition (Bartra 1993; Gudeman 2008; Nash 1993; Narotzky 2004). Garcia Canclini (1993), for instance, argues that promotion crafts by entities outside villages and towns:

encourage the separation of individuals from the community... they select the best artisan, they deal with them on an individual basis, and urge them to compete with one another. In the political realm, they intensify preexisting conflicts between groups and leaders through the distribution of credit and the demand of exclusivity of personal loyalties. (63)

To stay competitive some artisans, manipulate reciprocal ties to control the labor (often women’s and children’s unpaid contributions) and earnings of family and friends (Cook 1984, 1993; Cook and Binford 1990; Nakatani 1999; Narotzky 2004; Stephen 1991; Wilkinson-Weber 1997). The burden of intensification of work, as in craft production, has not weighed equally on all, and increasing interdependence of household members has not taken place in a peaceful environment (Gwynne and Kay 1999, 2000; de la Rocha and Escobar Latapí 2002). These studies have

contributed to this dissertation's analysis of local tensions emerging from increasing social and economic inequalities as individuals in rural communities increasingly engage in capitalist markets.

At the same time, however, craft production and sales enables families to feed and keep their families in the home villages in the countryside as well as improve standards of living even where land is scarce or unevenly distributed (Chibnik 2003; Colloredo-Mansfeld 1999). Artisan production constitutes for many families in rural communities a “regionally specific alternative to full-fledged capitalism” (Korovkin 1998:146). In some areas, the craft commodity market does not polarize local populations into labor and capital to the same extent or in exactly the same way as in other places where crafts are exported, and exploitation may be rather limited (e.g., Chibnik 2003; Smith 1984).⁷ Even conflict emerging from increased socioeconomic stratification may provide opportunities for renegotiating social relations of mutual support networks, ensuring minimal economic security and helping to create ties of affiliation—even between people of different socioeconomic positionings (Cohen 1999; Colloredo-Mansfeld 1999, 2002; Grimes and Milgram 2000; Nash 1993). New forms of ethno-development – i.e., production and export marketing of objects incorporating elements of indigenous identity (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009; DeHart 2010) – have served to reinforce commitments to traditional relationships of reciprocity and diverse forms of indigenous identification (Colloredo-Mansfeld 1999), as well as increase political solidarity, local control of development processes and national political participation (Bebbington 1996; Meisch and Rowe 1998). This dissertation

⁷ Carol Smith (1984a) shows, for instance, that the artisans of Totonicapán “would rather begin their own enterprise that pays them and their family a *lower* wage than remain as relatively well-paid workers, even in the community... This can be considered ‘irrational behaviour only if one gives no value to personal autonomy... [A] market or commodity economy is not sufficient to create the necessary polarization of labour and capital that produces capitalism. The state has been and is a necessary agent in that process” (91).

employs the creative tensions between competition, dependency, and cooperation in how artisans relate to each other and with non-artisan workers.⁸

These studies of small-scale commodity production in rural areas have, importantly, also moved the discussion further away from speculating on the transitory or unstable nature of craft production towards asking about the ways that they are changing and evolving. Much evidence now exists showing that rural domestic industry and its many characteristic features is a relatively enduring feature of local and national economies, appearing in various times and places under conditions that can be specified through comparative analysis (Littlefield and Reynolds 1990)⁹. Gavin Smith (1979), for instance, examined “rural-based petty producers” in central Peru, for the period of 1880-1970. They were largely subsistence producers, faced with severe scarcity of productive resources that was forcing them to become “multi-occupational”. The particular Peruvian conditions of extreme scarcity of productive resources within the confines of an extremely unstable economy made impossible a technological upgrading of the means of production, so effectively blocking capital accumulation on any substantial scale. In Smith’s study, we also see some concrete ways through which people are incorporated into abstract dynamics of capitalist expansion, which are deeply and necessarily heterogeneous.

⁸ Expression and creation of cooperative relations in social and discursive practice is intimately tied to the structuring of local hierarchy and how power is exercised. While it can be argued that the rhetoric of cooperation is manipulated in the service to and construction of hierarchy (Bourdieu 1977), local hierarchy and prestige is often measured and constrained by local norms of morality as well as commitment and obligation (Keane 1997). As such, power and prestige within the community cannot be used in the brute exercise of political domination but is relationally negotiated and conferred (see also J. Scott 1990).

⁹ Scott Cook’s (1981, 1984) work, in particular, is notable for his instance on viewing artisans and their communities as characterized not only by inequalities in wealth and social prestige prior to the arrival of the Spanish in the sixteenth century, but also by role in the commoditization of crafts pre-dating global capitalist markets and the rise of the international tourist market. Cook, in writing on Oaxacan brickmakers and textile workers, further argued for viewing rural craft production in term of “industrialization within industrialization” – “the process of the appearance, persistence or expansion of labour-intensive forms of industrial commodity production within interstices or regions of capitalist economies where capital-intensive, factory industry is predominant” (1984:4). In other words, small-scale commodity production contained internal sources, rather than being entirely dependent on external sources, of economic change.

There is also growing recognition that the effects of improvements in transportation and communications have led to multidirectional cultural and economic flows rather than one-way penetration of capitalism from centers of economic power (Appadurai 1996; Kearney 1995; Little 2000; Wood 2000). Thus, anthropological studies now offer more nuanced understandings of how households have mobilized domestic labor to produce artifacts and agricultural foodstuffs for their own consumption, while also relying on systematic production for exchange. More importantly, the reasons for differential participation in craft production between households, villages, or industries are complex, historically contingent, and fraught with contradiction.

As these studies effectively demonstrate, cultural factors are just as important as economic and political ones shaping how, when, and why individuals from rural and indigenous communities engage in craft production for expanding global markets. On the one hand, they place local gender, class, and ethnic relations of domination at the forefront of their analyses. On the other hand, they recognize that these relations are framed by locally contextualized moral economies. Finally, they recognize the importance of situating the relations of production and reproduction in craft trades in the ethnographic present within a larger historical context of local, national, and global politics. My dissertation builds on this research, illustrating the way that local communities are internally diverse, yet are dynamically created out of historically contingent processes that generate shared ways of understanding and interacting.

Development Paradigms

Rural Industry, Artisan Entrepreneurs, and Small-Scale Capitalist Development

I turn now to the development paradigms that impact the people of Quinua and provide an economic counterpoint to my anthropological analysis. I focus on these particular models for economic progress because development planners have heavily integrated them into specific policies and programs for artisans in Quinua as well as among other socioeconomically disadvantaged populations and communities throughout Latin America. In the last two decades, artisan producers have witnessed a profound shift in their role in economic policy. No longer seen as remnants of stagnating or backward economies, artisans are now central protagonists of national development and capitalism throughout Latin America. This move marks a distinct shift in language and perspective of the neoliberal “business-friendly” approach to development, from one that focused solely on macroeconomic performance to one that now strategically integrates concern for microeconomic processes.

This new vision for small-scale craft production, which would gain ascendancy within government and international policymaking circles for development, began coalescing into a coherent economic model in the 1980s. In their influential book, for instance, *The Second Industrial Divide* (1984), Michael Piore and Charles ; see also Sabel 1989) argued that rather than a model of standardized mass-production, the key to economic growth lay in “flexible specialization” in which “regional conglomerations of small, inter-linked artisanal enterprises” were the key to national economic growth. For them, competition, and thus exploitation, can be controlled by the “creation, through politics, of an industrial community that restricts the forms of competition to those favoring innovation” (1984:17). There is a historical dimension to these potential “industrial communities” – the enterprises are established on preexisting artisan

networks already oriented to the products of the future industry. The craft culture – e.g., coordination among the producers, regulation of competition, cooperation for purchases and sales, and the management of apprenticeship – ultimately provided the basic principles for the organizational “know-how” that marked the beginning of the early industrial districts. Thus began a new phase in development thinking that saw small-scale local production efforts as dynamic contributors to economic growth, and growing rather than declining in importance.¹⁰

In Peru, economist Hernando de Soto’s work (1989, 2000, 2002) has been particularly influential.¹¹ De Soto celebrated the idea that burdensome legal and regulatory hurdles to owning property suppressed entrepreneurship, impeded economic progress, and perpetuated poverty in developing countries.¹² As the founder of the *Instituto Libertad y Democracia* (Institute for Liberty and Democracy) in Lima, de Soto became directly involved in neoliberal reorganization and policymaking during the administration of Alan Garcia (1985-1990). Additionally, de Soto’s work became a powerful foundation for international public policy, such as the World Bank’s “Doing Business” agenda, launched in 2003.

¹⁰ A host of critiques emerged alongside more celebratory accounts of Piore and Sabel’s ideas. Honing in on the same processes observed by Piore and Sabel, David Harvey’s (1989) *Condition of Postmodernity* brought attention to the apparent shift from assembly-line production toward “flexible accumulation” characterized by smaller, more flexible ways of producing and organizing societies (see also Blim and Rothstein 1992; Collins 2009; Wood 2000). These ways often included subcontracting, outsourcing, and dispersed sites of production. More recent scholarship provides ethnographic research that supports such less-than-sublime accounts (e.g. Narotzky and Smith 2006; Smart and Smart 2005). Rothstein (2005) notes, for instance, that Piore and Sabel argue that drudgery is not inherent in flexible production, and that the politics of industrial districts can restrict forms of competition to encourage innovation, not just exploitation. She argues that in many contexts innovation and drudgery are not alternatives, but complementary sources of advantage.

¹¹ Panizza (2000:189) argues that “de Soto’s (1989) apologia of free-market economics as a crusade in favour of ‘the little man in the slums’ and against the country’s political and economic oligarchy set up the ideological ground for Fujimori’s neoliberal reforms” (cited in Gilbert 2002:2). Gilbert (2002:2-3) further remarks on de Soto’s influence in the World Bank (see also Bromley 1990). For a discussion of the assumptions at work in de Soto’s models see Timothy Mitchell’s work (2004, 2008).

¹² Douglass North’s work (1981) was also influential in this regard. He agrees that undue restrictions on property rights potentially limit private investment and thus impedes opportunities for economic growth.

The focus on business and microenterprise in neoliberal discourse gained further momentum in the 1990s with the emergence of a confluent interest in industrial or economic “clusters,”¹³ as they are now often referred to in policy documents and the literature. Particularly relevant, Harvard Business School Professor Michael Porter, in his widely popular book *The Competitive Advantage of Nations* (1990), puts forward a management theory of local productivity linked to national competitiveness within the context of the global economy.¹⁴ In this productivity paradigm, “geographic concentrations” of interconnected producers and workers specializing in related products are the key to global, competitive economies that are marked by increasing complexity, knowledge-based, and dynamic. Charles Hale (2002, 2005, 2006) argues that models that conflate cultural diversity and capitalist enterprises, as do business associations and IPRs, represent a new form of neoliberalism in Latin America that shifts away from assimilationist models of nation-building and economic development to multiculturalism. This “neoliberal multiculturalism” is a strategic way of re-activating local community culture to shift economic risk and responsibility from the state to local institutions and social organizations (Gustafson 2002; Rose 1999, 2000; Sieder 2002; Wade 1997).

Especially based on the work of Porter,¹⁵ de Soto, and others, the study of comparative national economic advantages has turned its attention to the importance of local contexts in which work and live “micro entrepreneurs” and its role in strengthening competitiveness in global markets. These arguments foreground, in particular, informal social networks of local

¹³ The “clusters” model is one among several different models that have at its base the local face-to-face context of production (e.g., industrial districts, regional clusters, new industrial spaces). See Martin 2001 and Martin and Sunley 2003 for overviews.

¹⁴ In Chapter 2, I discuss how Porter has been specifically employed by scholars to reflect on the Peruvian case as well as how these studies have influenced policymaking for rural populations. In Chapter 3, I delve deeper into the case of Quinoa artisans, who have participated in business associations that were organized from programs based on Porter’s ideas.

¹⁵ See Porter 2010 for a presentation on Peru’s economic cluster and small business dynamics.

producers in overcoming barriers to markets and productivity. For example, face-to-face cooperation and consultation between firms and between their owners and workers create opportunities to improve production processes through nimble mobilization of local trade knowledge as well as for flexible resolution of conflicting demands of the business (Amin & Thrift 1992; Garofoli 1991; Humphrey & Schmitz 1998; Meyer-Stamer 1999; Porter 1998b; A.J. Scott 1988, 1997; Storper 1995; Storper & Scott, 1992; Storper & Venables, 2004). Workers may subsequently set up new “micro-enterprises” employing skills they acquired working for others in the trade. Local rivalry too pressures firms to lower costs and innovate to capture market shares and profits (Hollis 2003; Lin, Tung, & Huang 2006; Sakakibara & Porter 2001). Furthermore, scholars have deployed these ideas in the Latin American context and have argued that localized small producers reveal the power of local collaboration to solve resource problems (Altenburg & Meyer-Stamer 1999; Giuliani, Pietrobelli, & Rabellotti 2005; Pietrobelli & Rabellotti 2006; Sandee and Van Hulsen 2000; Schmitz 2000; Van Hulsen 2005; Visser 1996, 1999).¹⁶

A notion of “culture” is essential to these arguments, even if that notion put forward is distant from contemporary anthropological understandings. For one, the work patterns and expectations described above are seen as necessarily rooted in a specific shared social/physical space, in which people live and work, face-to-face, on a daily basis. Through such everyday

¹⁶ A multiplicity of studies on clusters have been produced over the last ten years in Latin America, some aimed at examining the general conditions that have led to the formation of clusters (Ramos 1998; Cassiolato & Lastres 2005) and other based on case studies. There is a huge variety of the latter, centered on areas such as dairy-industry clusters (Dirven 2000), including studies carried out in Chile, Colombia, Uruguay, Argentina and Mexico; or on ecotourism resorts (ECLAC), which together with general policy considerations includes cases in Chile, Mexico, Brazil and Costa Rica; there are also others that deal with agro-industry clusters – specifically apple production in Brazil, wine in Chile, cooking oil in Argentina and palm oil and hearts in Ecuador. Added to these are other studies such as Schmitz (1999) on the shoe manufacturing cluster in the Sinos Valley in Brazil; Meyer-Stamer (1998) on the ceramic tile cluster in Santa Catarina, also Brazil; Visser (1999) on the clothing industry cluster in La Victoria, Lima; and Rabellotti (1998) on another shoe manufacturing cluster in Guadalajara, Mexico.

social interaction, local economic actors have built up and reinforced unique forms of social organization, based on shared norms and values, which facilitate production of goods or services (Fromhold-Eisebith 2004; Maskell 2001; Storper 1995; Storper & Venables 2004; Tura & Harmaakorpi 2005).

According to micro-industrial development theorists, belonging to a “community” is the main relational basis that permits competitive interaction to take place in the production system while preserving cooperation and a place for all those who belong to the community. This social system of production has “differentiated” or specialized kinds of roles. The role of the entrepreneurial producer, in particular, holds that some individuals within the community, in exercising a degree of autonomy, are able to forge and sustain social relationships with individuals and institutions outside the community. Accordingly, an economic rationality, defined as “calculative actions undertaken through universal human faculty of choice” guides all other domains, from the political to the social (Rose 1999:141). Thus, The “entrepreneurial” individuals are expected to be self-actualizing, economically independent and responsible exercisers of free, but limited, choice. As Rose (1999) argues, the key figure is not simply an entrepreneur of business and economy, but more so the “entrepreneur of the self,” who:

operate[s] a regime of the self where competent personhood is thought to depend upon the continual exercise of freedom, and where one is encouraged to understand one’s life, actually or potentially, not in terms of fate or social status, but in terms of one’s success or failure acquiring the skills and making the choices to actualize oneself. (Rose 1999: 87)

Ultimately, the general model on which contemporary development programs are founded has at the base a methodological individualism, and the “community” and cooperative behavior become vehicles for economic reward as well as for individual self-actualization (Rose 2000; Veltmeyer 2008). The particular subjects through which neoliberal government currently works include not

only particular economic actors conducting themselves as “competitive, profit-seeking agents,” but also members of different kinds of communities who take advantage of the resources offered by collectives.

Based on the policy implications of this work, Latin American governments, once favoring grand capital-intensive forms of industrialization, now prioritize assisting the businesses of a small-scale, taking them as evidence that the capitalist system has not stagnated but maintains a vitality and open-endedness. Small-scale production, now referred to in current neoliberal policy as “micro- and small-enterprises,” are said to be constantly churning: “Not only are new firms being created (new starts or births) while others are closing, but existing (surviving) firms are expanding and contracting in size” (Liedholm 2002:5). In this environment, men and women setting up new small firms, that is, ordinary, hard-working and enterprising people are now seen as bearers of the positive quality of entrepreneurship. Such dynamic movement has excited governments, institutions, and development specialists, particularly in Latin America, where many such local dynamics have been recorded (Nadvi and Schmitz 1994; Schmitz 2000; Visser 1996, 1999).

These records of dynamic growth of the artisan sector in Peru over the past several decades seemingly attest to the opportunities of the global marketplace as well as to the importance of local arrangements to take advantage of such opportunities in unexpected ways. But rural industry, like artisan production, according to development research, could actually thrive, rather than simply survive, if certain conditions are met (e.g., innovation in design, skill development, technology upgrade, and market development) (Altenberg and Meyer-Stamer 1998). Rural, small-scale industrialization, like the sort that has emerged in Quinua, has thus taken on a special place in Latin American development thinking and policy formulation.

The Collision and Confluence of Development Models with Local Artisans: Business Associations and IPRs

Current development policy promoted by state, NGOS, and international organizations has encouraged greater economic inclusion through neoliberal structures of organization and promulgating formal IPRs. In this section I lay out the general programs for business associations and IPRs as two concrete manifestations of these models that are at once community-based and externally derived. Both of these techniques reflect the sorts of institutional frameworks that state agencies and other institutions are now establishing in rural towns and villages (the “more isolated locations”) especially throughout Latin American countries in order to move regional spaces towards “advanced economies.” Policymakers and development specialists believe that these programs may help local producers overcome certain cultural beliefs, norms, and codes of conduct, that still inhibit development of a “productive economic culture,” that is, a complex series of “supportive attitudes and values,” including innovation, competition, accountability, and high regulatory standards (Porter 2000:22). Ultimately, these new organizational structures are meant to smooth the integration of rural economies into the greater rationality of capitalist markets, while still taking advantage of local cultural and social assets. The implications for governments’ standpoints is clear: “development” is a series of externally-derived interventions to forge institutional frameworks that can govern – formalize, streamline, and refine – socioeconomic life towards greater efficiency in producing and marketing for global markets.¹⁷

¹⁷ In addition to the work of de Soto and Porter, other scholars have highlighted the role of institutions in economic growth. Douglass North (1981, 1990), in particular, argues that institutions, which he defines as the rules of the game that govern the way which in which human beings structure their social interactions, ultimately determine a nation’s economic and political fortunes.

The role of the “entrepreneurial artisan,” rather than the community, is the key to how these associations function. Business associations are generally new market-oriented organizations that promote inter-firm cooperation. Specifically, these organizations offer a particular kind of arrangement of roles of which constitutes a production, and thus social reproduction, system in the local community. Through them, individual producers’ relationships for production are rearranged in order to optimize them for global market production and competitiveness. According to Porter business associations can “enhance cluster competitiveness... [and]... institutionalize collective linkages. In addition to providing a neutral forum for identifying common needs, constraints and opportunities, associations can serve as focal points for efforts to address them” (Porter 1998a:258). By participating in these local collective institutions, individuals may share work orders, labor, specialized skills, and expensive equipment. They may organize subcontracting, enforcement of product standards, or even joint purchasing of production and marketing resources. The success of these organizations depends heavily on those individual producers identified as “entrepreneurs” and others with trade knowledge and experience as well as an understanding of urban and international market norms and expectations. Building networks through associations thus encourages interaction among these “entrepreneurs” and other local leaders in education and government in order to increase information sharing that might not take place otherwise. Such carefully conceived collective action, such as the formulation of local standards of quality that result in a reputation for the community, can also benefit other producers working in the trade. Ultimately, under neoliberal models for local development, business associations, rather than a body politic, are groups of individual entrepreneurs – “model neoliberal citizens who strategizes for her- or himself among

various social, political, and economic options, not one who strives with others to alter or organize these options” (W. Brown 2003:43).

The second development intervention that I examine – the strategic celebration of artisans as agents of cultural innovation under new IPR-based initiatives – is similarly founded on the notion of the “entrepreneurial self” (Rose 1999). In general, culture has attained a new value in rural development projects and consumption practices. New forms of ethno-development, including cultural tourism and marketing of culturally distinctive export products, for instance, are perceived by governments and international institutions as having the capacity to foster rural economic revitalization, protect traditional technologies, and promote cultural identity (Brown 2003; Comaroff and Comaroff 2009; Coombe 1998, 2005, 2009; Yudice 2003). To defend the exclusive rights of producers to access key cultural assets because of their membership in the group (e.g., community), the Peruvian state now promotes a form of intellectual property (IP) known as the denomination of origin (DO)¹⁸ certifies the production of regional goods (Chan 2011). These new legal strategies are also part of the overall competitive strategy for the nation, for, as Colloredo-Mansfeld points out in synthesizing the work of scholars on cultural difference, “cultural assets differentiate livelihoods and allow some to earn more because of that difference” (2011:52). DOs at once allow the state to shape the demand for “authentic” and “traditional” goods while pressuring local production methods to conform to “export” quality standards.

In general, the theoretical argument underpinning both business associations and DOs for pursuing economic prosperity in Latin America has an inherent by contradiction: on the one hand, they celebrate and seek to expand on what already exists in rural communities (e.g., social relationships for production, artisanal technologies, cultural symbols); on the other, they seek to

¹⁸ Before being able to apply this supposedly collective form of IP rights to their products, which certifies them for exportation, local artisans must adopt certain technical reforms to their production methods.

shape and transform these social and cultural resources into something more aligned with values of profit-earning and capitalist efficiency (e.g, business relationships, export standards, consumer demand for “authentic” tradition). The manner in which this contradiction is worked out in local practices ultimately may, and often does, lead to new forms of exclusion. In regards to both business associations and DOs, the provisional benefits are conserved for those who are capable, and thus deemed deserving by the state, to take advantage of these endeavors encouraging export market participation. Ultimately, the more “entrepreneurial” individuals (i.e., well-connected, experienced in selling in larger markets, having resources and skills to adopt technical standards) are privileged over others.

These strategies further build on the groundwork laid by proponents of neoliberal policies in earlier decades, like Hernando de Soto, who saw formalization of property titles as the recipe for overcoming poverty. Specifically, both development interventions seek to provide the legal means by which the poor may the power of social and cultural resources. I thus argue that, on one hand, the models through which business associations and IPRs have been rationalized *do* take into account local contextualized ways of seeing, understanding, and enacting social relationships. On the other hand, however, they rely on partial – specifically, depoliticized, instrumental, technical, and profit-oriented – understandings of local cultural and social assets (especially cooperation, community, and local interdependencies) through which people build secure and meaningful livelihoods. In this sense, the proposed reforms to the production system thus encourage people to adopt a possessive, instrumental, and entrepreneurial attitude toward their culture and the social relations of reproduction on which they have historically (Elyachar 2005 and Lowrey 2008, cited in Coombe 2009). Their institutional structures make possible:

the production of citizens as individual entrepreneurial actors across all dimensions of their lives, by the reduction of civil society to a domain for exercising this

entrepreneurship, and by the figuration of the state as a firm whose products are rational individual subjects, an expanding economy, national security, and global power. (W. Brown 2003: 57)

Producers must ultimately learn to project their needs, aspirations and relationships (with family and community) in the languages of market and business culture. Some groups are privileged by this discourse while others may be further marginalized.

This neoliberal, entrepreneurial model operates on particular assumptions about community. For one, it presupposes a sense of belonging, of a “we,” between workers and owners. This common identification arises positively and obviously from shared cultural and social symbols, traditions of technologies and material practices of sociality. The model neglects how “relational assets,” like trust and reciprocity, map onto local politics (Hadjimichalis 2006a, 2006b). This romance of community, in which community is invoked as an ideal space of consensus and civic engagement, ultimately legitimates hierarchies of gender, class, and nation that capitalism requires (Joseph 2002).¹⁹ Relationships are understood in terms of utility-maximization strategies and markets: some informal ties are valuable for skills and finance sharing; others slowdown or block such provisioning, causing firms to fall behind and hinder market competitiveness. Furthermore, this model belies any struggles by people themselves to build such collective solidarity just as self-consciously as any shared collective project from which a community identity may be forged (G. Smith 1991, 2002; Williams 1985 [1976], 1989).

The privileged position occupied by small-scale producers and local communities in development policies does not derive from a universal consensus with regard to how craftwork,

¹⁹ Miranda Joseph (2002) asks why *community*, even though relentlessly problematic, always returns. Decades before Joseph’s research, Raymond Williams similarly wrote that “it was when I suddenly realized that no one ever used ‘community’ in a hostile sense that I saw how dangerous it was” (1979:119, cited in Calabrese 1991:108) See also Agrawal and Gibson 2001, Brosius 1997, Brosius *et al.*, Creed *et al.* 2006, and Li 2000 for critical ethnographies that caution against the romance of community.

and local production activities in general, actually work on the ground. Rather, the specific strategies through which this neoliberal micro-economic paradigm is actually implemented in rural villages and towns demonstrate dramatic disparities between the paradigm and how people actually build meaningful livelihoods. So, beneath the surface of this view to markets as embedded in social and cultural affiliations and networks, however, lies a much more profound set of ambiguities, tensions, and contradictions.

Acknowledging that internal conflicts over access to economic resources and political power, however, does not preclude unified struggles against external pressures and challenges. As scholars have shown for the Andes in particular sometimes being part of a community leads to conflict, and sometimes to celebration, and in any case communities remain central to indigenous self-determination (Colloredo-Mansfeld 2002, 2009; Orlove 1977; G. Smith 1989; Weismantel 2006).²⁰ Rudi Colloredo-Mansfeld offers a notion of “community” as diverse and contingent:

Having long ago lost the certainties of shared work, worship, and residence, Andean communities have elaborated rituals and other means of imagination to restore bonds of memory and identity (Wibbelsman 2005). Their imagined affinities, however, hit up against fractious, day-to-day business. Indigenous collectivities thus are also ‘produced communities’ where imagination yields to persuasion, coercion, and resistance. (2009:25-26)

Thus, as Gavin Smith (2002) argues, rather than shared interests or identity, membership in a community may *first* be constituted by a process of being engaged in the same argument (see also Coombe 2011 and Hyland 2005 *et al.*). This dissertation thus emphasizes and relies on *community-making processes* rather than communities as discrete “natural” social actors. My project responds to William Roseberry’s (1989:228) challenge to anthropologists to carry out “an examination of the cultural forms and symbols around which alternative images of

²⁰ See also Jackson and Warren (2005), Watanabe (1992), and Fischer and Benson (2006) for Guatemala.

community can be built, and an exploration of the organizational or institutional forms through which such images can be given political expression.” I thus consider “community” as emerging from an ongoing process in which the meanings of shared identity are renegotiated. A focus on community processes also opens up analytical space for discussing how NGOs and state governments and other external organizations are also necessarily implicated in community identity.

Analytical Approach

Set in the rural district of Quinua, an “artisanal cluster” in Peru (Hernando and Van Hulsen 2001), my research takes a critical anthropological approach to business associations and IPRs. Rather than juxtaposing one dominant intervention with one subordinate form of resistance or compliance, my analysis assumes that grassroots actors re-work development projects in local settings (Bebbington 2000; Long 2001). “Clients” actively formulate and pursue their own projects of livelihood, where external interventions become resources for and constraints to their strategies and interpretative frames (de Certeau 1984; Giddens 1984). What people do to secure livelihoods in places “targeted” for intervention are also subject to other pressures, motivations and power structures, including changing economic and political situations (Keane 1997; Maiva 2001; Ziai 2007). A study of human (inter)action must thus be situated within analyses of these other forces.

Here I set forth a framework for how artisans reconstruct their material and social worlds via ongoing, transformative actions within and beyond development projects. Relying on actor-oriented and socio-symbolic constructionist analyses of official documents, every-day talk, and non-verbal behavior and feelings (Bakhtin 1981; Goffman 1959; Keane 2007), I critically consider

how these texts emerge and relate to specific contexts structured by ceramics, design imitation, and other objects and practices (Gee 1999; Johnstone 2002). The actor-oriented analysis reveals important emergent cooperative and competitive practices and values enabling shared ways for ascribing meaning to the world. These processes are complex, often ambiguous and thus open to “old” and “new” framings and contestations (Giddens 1979; Van Leeuwen 2008). This framework accounts for degrees of agency, but generalizes beyond idiosyncrasies of micro-social behavior.

Classic notions of culture²¹ are both “constraining” and “enabling” in ways that feed into narratives of power and inequality (Ortner 2006:14-15). That is, as Sherry B. Ortner explains, culture is both “allowing people to see, feel, imagine, understand some things), and constraining (disabling people from seeing, feeling, imagining, and understanding other things)” (2006:14). Following this perspective, I confront the difficult questions of *what* is being valued in terms of well-being and aspirations, *who* does the valuing, and *why* economic and social factors interact with culture to unequally allocate access to meaningful livelihoods. Ortner further argues:

The only alternative to recognizing that subalterns have certain prior and ongoing cultural authenticity is to view subaltern responses to domination as ad hoc and incoherent, springing not from their own senses of order, justice, and meaning, but only from some set of ideas called into being by the situation of domination itself” (2006:50).

I suggest that people of various degrees of economic advantage and disadvantage in local villages build purposeful and meaningful social relationships, but these relationships are routinely frustrated by multi-scalar inequities. The ethnographic material I examine in the following chapters ultimately reveals that circles of affiliation of many producers become more constrained as they move away from family, neighbors, and friends. Even individuals in Quinua

²¹ This dissertation does not pretend to offer a universal or definitive answer to these questions, recognizing first and foremost that culture has been defined in myriad ways (Kroeber and Kluckhohn 1963), and, for this reason, many anthropologists hesitate to privilege one definition over another. In fact, over the past several decades many anthropologists have argued for dropping the culture concept altogether. For an overview of these issues see Ortner 1999 and Fox 1999.

who have significant advantages of material resources and social precedence have many obligations to other kinds of producers and social others who they rely on for work and often friendship. At the same time, however, social actors have capacities to process these social experiences, and to devise ways to maneuver and negotiate their stakes in diverse kinds of social relationships. In Giddens' terms, they are at least "partially knowing subjects" (1979:5) who are able to reflect to some degree on their circumstances and, by implication, develop a certain level of critique and possible resistance.

This dissertation draws on thirteen months of ethnographic research between 2008 and 2012. I relied on participant observation, recorded events, and photographs of community and family activities. I carried out censuses of twenty households located in the village center as well as in the surrounding community hamlets. I analyze documents for "official" state goals and project designs for initiatives organizing business associations. Comparative analysis of key informant interviews with participating artisans and officials reveals actors' motivations and transformations of these projects counter to official plans. Analysis of in-depth, life history interviews with 1) artisan families identified as key actors in development projects, and 2) people identified as "unknown" artisans and who tend not to be members of associations, offer critical insight into diverging motivations for engaging certain cooperative structures over others (Burdick 1995). Through these histories, I gained detailed information on events leading up to people's present-day pottery production practices, focusing on fluid moments between conflict and cooperation. These conversations also reveal how artisans differentially interpret their and others' participation/non-participation in business associations as well as different use of designs and ceramic techniques. I also focused on multiple development projects carried out in the district covering a range of past projects that underlie present projects. This approach follows

the lead of scholars who show how in one region specific programs and projects for development have been interpreted as a result of earlier experiences (e.g., Li 2007; Vincent 2012). Not all current or previous trends in development practices that have happened in Quinoa will be discussed in this dissertation. I do not have sufficient space, much less information, to do so. I have selected the projects and models that artisans and others working in craft production tend to focus on in conversation as well as those in which a large portion of artisans participate.

Observational data, collected while I helped make ceramics in artisans' homes and sell at local and national fairs, show intimate details of how artisans talk to each other about sharing production space or tools, others' involvement in business associations, and other practices of sociality. I also spent extended periods of time with producers during their time outside of making ceramics, participating in family gatherings, community celebrations, and more mundane activities like farming in their fields and visiting friends and neighbors. Witnessing informants' actions and social activities as they occur is also crucial to understanding connections between what people say and how they behave. Ethnography is ultimately useful to understanding the deviation of implemented schemes for development from programmatic aspects and the limitations inherent in globalized development regimes.

I rely on historical documents, including art historical books and official development studies published by the state as well as NGOs, that offer an overview, albeit incomplete, of political economic processes that span to pre-Hispanic times. While I focus on the twentieth century onward, I also include a brief recount of the socioeconomic and cultural patterns intertwining with diverse economies in the region of Ayacucho. I specifically trace changes in the ways that people engage each other as well as productive processes, an approach that follows the work of such scholars as Roseberry (1989), Wolf (1982), and Narotzky and Smith (2006).

The main tendency that I draw out of my understanding the colonial period in Ayacucho is that out of the period emerged a class, although incipient, of artisans. I discuss this later in Chapter 2. I then jump ahead to the twentieth century, primarily during the early 1920s at about the time that artisanal producers and craft workers were coopted by *indigenista* movement and, a decade or so later, by state government development policies and programs. This period marks the emergence of a coherent ideological and material role for rural communities in official development policy.

Layout of the Dissertation

In the following chapters, I analyze how local ceramicists in rural Quinua engage the practices and meanings of recent state projects to promote small-business formation and management, artisanal traditions, and cultural identity. I argue that, as people seek particular kinds of relationships within specific development interventions, they rely to various degrees on locally contextualized understandings and improvisations, which James Scott (1998) calls *metis*, for how relationships and collaboration are built. Specifically, I argue that an understanding of artisan “enterprises” or “firms” as they are so often called in Latin American development policy, requires attention to the relationships both within and between households, and further, other kinds of relationships – based on neighborliness, friendship, socioeconomic positioning, gender norms, extended kinship, reciprocity, community belonging – that bind households to the village and to each other. This argument builds on the work of other scholars who urge for a more expansive, political, and performative understanding of “economy,” in which economy is constituted by diverse forms of economic organization and exchange (Gibson-Graham 1996; T. Mitchell 2008). The district of Quinua is thus better characterized as an economically

heterogeneous space, composed of shifting, yet semi-stable, constellations of political and social alliances. And these relations are fundamentally implicated in distributional inequities and multi-scalar strategic alliances (G. Smith 1999). I thus show how artisan producers (dis)associate with others, even non-artisans, for various reasons, like to reduce costs, maintain economic autonomy, or for companionship, and in diverse ways that cannot be sufficiently captured by employing the capitalist/non-capitalist model (Maiva 2001; Ziai 2007). My findings suggest that any attempts to reorganize these relationships—and the practices through which they are built—lead to new conflicts. I also argue that the normative models and business practices evident among ceramic producers in Quinoa, however, are not separate and opposed to official models of progress and business ethics promoted in current policy agendas; they are forms of “vernacular development,”²² wherein producers emulate some aspects of the programmatic development schemes offered by the state, but they at once adapt them to the local livelihood possibilities and constraints. Importantly, conflicts over local ideas about cooperation and community in the context of state projects pose challenges to, but do not prevent, collective undertakings.

Chapter 2 initiates my ethnographic analysis of livelihoods by focusing on the household, which is the main social and economic unit in Quinoa, both historically and present-day. I show that, although this household unit, usually the nuclear family, is the primary foundation for ceramic production in Quinoa, it does not work in a vacuum. The nuclear household is also affected by linkages established via money exchange between commodity markets and between family members. These linkages have increased in importance as markets expanded and have become more globally integrative. I thus argue that to arrive at a better understanding of social

²² Colloredo-Mansfeld urges scholars to see how taken-for-granted everyday elements of Indigenous community life (e.g., keeping lists of communal labor, the work of local councils) are “vernacular statecraft.” The term “vernacular” is borrowed from architecture in which “builders imitate and appropriate standard elements of widely used design, adapting them for local conditions” (Colloredo-Mansfeld 2009:17).

life in the contemporary *pueblo* and *comunidad campesina*, we have to attend to the real and relative autonomy of individual producers and their wider networks of connections – within and across communities and in the labor and commodity markets of the country.

In Chapter 2, I also provide the historical context for the ethnographic present. The historically contextualized account of the social and economic life in Quinua provides the foundation for my ethnographic analysis of present-day production. Following nearly a decade of armed conflict and three decades of neoliberal reform, the district of Quinua has undergone major social and economic changes. As I show, these transformations link up with a longer history of intertwined internal and external processes of change related to reproduction of historical identities and forms of moral imaginings in relation to the concepts *artisan* and *community* in state economic policy. For this part of my analysis, I draw on Gavin Smith and Susanna Narotzky who argue that rather than simply assume that people living and working in close proximity act through a “community-like superior interest,” we must tease out how “ongoing formative practices of social agents – contradictory, conflictual, and fragmented as they may be – arise out of specific histories in which agency unfolds through narrow cracks between the tectonic plates of the logic of capitalist reproduction” (G. Smith and Narotzky 2005:47-8). Through this historically-situated analysis, we gain a better sense of the kinds of other pressures, motivations, and power structures, including changing economic and political situations, that local people, families, and communities are subject to in places “targeted” for intervention (Maiva 2001; Ziai 2007). Seen this way, the exclusionary and inclusionary dynamics of communal organization is better comprehended since it takes into account the material and social inequalities among members of the community alongside interdependencies.

Chapter 3 deals with recent state projects that have been implemented since the early 2000s to organize artisans into business associations. My research demonstrates that the role of the “entrepreneurial artisan” and not the community, however, has been key to these associations. In doing so, I further suggest, associations largely do not promote “community” advancement, but advancement selective individuals and families. Project planners, for example, selected leaders based on who they saw as exercising a degree of autonomy and thus able to forge and sustain social relationships with individuals and institutions both within and outside their communities. This chapter thus shows how these projects assume a particular nature of how social relationships are built in Quinoa. I also show how local artisans disrupt these assumptions as Quinuenos employ pre-existing socio-cultural practices to engage these organizations. Development specialists planned associations to encourage collective efficiency and entrepreneurship while also supporting a cultural heritage and identity. To understand the reasoning behind this local approach to development, I first turn to official documents published by CARE-Peru, the US Agency for International Development, and a few other organizations. The models on which business management projects have been predicated assume that belonging to a community is the main relational basis that permits competitive interaction in local productions system. This relational basis simultaneously preserves cooperation and a place for all those who belong to the community, the latter consisting of “differentiated,” or specialized, kinds of roles. In order to optimize these social relationships shaping production, development specialists promoted and assisted in the creation of business associations.

I argue that while this strategy can be successful to a point, it also overlooks existing inequities in communities where such projects have been implemented. This means that “relational” and “social” assets on which associations are built have incorporated ambiguous

dynamics of reciprocity and inequality, dependency and distinction. Resources funneled through associations support small business development for artisan potters, but association leaders with entrepreneurial potential are also influential, prominent, and well-informed people in the Quinua district. I show how the social and economic organization of the Quinua district has provided the foundation from which artisans build the relationships shaping business associations. Association projects, however, did not take into account the complexity of local relational dynamics, assuming that people working in the artisan trade would continue to identify as a community. In this way, business association projects have unintentionally rewarded existing economic “winners” and further marginalized disadvantaged producers. At issue, too, is how more disadvantaged producers of ceramic goods have disputed elite claims while also negotiating, circumventing, and even adapting associations to fit their own “projects” for personal and collective livelihoods. Many artisans, for instance, claim that certain people benefitting from associations are not “true” Quinua artisans. I thus show how conflicting values and goals emerge from real material differences between artisans, making present-day strategies to build cooperation and community problematic. I further demonstrate how local actors critique their own experience of domination.

Chapter 4 builds on and expands my analysis of discourses of “true artisan” by analyzing artisans’ tactics of appropriation. From an ethnographically situated analysis, I show how imitation and innovation are not merely economic matters, as current IPR initiatives frame them. They are also profoundly personal, moral and political. This chapter thus highlights and examines the cultural and moral context of artisans’ tactics of appropriation in Quinua. In particular, I analyze how artisans in Quinua share, borrow, and even “steal” designs from others. A vernacular property regime, based on a moral economy of mutual obligation, enables certain

forms of copying and sharing, particularly between family members and friends. When people perceive transgression of these moral boundaries, accusations of envy and arguments over aesthetic plagiarism involve social offenses: artisans minimize others' often-small technical and stylistic enhancements as “stolen” or unoriginal.

These conflicts importantly bear on the possibilities and limitations for international and state legal frameworks promoting collective trademarks and designation of origins (DO), which are supposedly more inclusive. While the DO initiative for Quinoa ceramics is at present only in the initial planning stages, producers nonetheless recognize and dispute adoption of distinctive marks derived from a shared craft heritage that seem to enable more economically and political powerful groups. The primary work in locally applying a DO in Quinoa would place primary concern around enhancing competitiveness and enforcing quality “export” standards. It is ultimately up to benefit-seeking groups to prove that they are deserving of using such a mark; those who would continue to rely on certain “traditional” modes of work (e.g., making large, heavy ceramics unsuitable for export) would be relegated to the hidden category of *undistinguished* (Chan 2011).

In Chapter 5, the conclusion of this dissertation, I provide implications for policymaking, arguing most generally that local context and externally derived models should be mutually informing. In previous chapters, I showed how conflicting values and goals emerge from real material and social differences between artisans, making problematic present-day strategies to build the kind of programmatic and instrumental notions of cooperation and community promoted by official channels. In Chapter 5, I emphasize, however, that even as producers evaluate each other, sometimes arguing over the terms of evaluation, they are nonetheless expressing moral aspirations for themselves, their trade networks, and the wider community. In

general, as this final chapter explores, producers are concerned to emphasize that social positioning, particularly in relation to kin and wider community networks is determined above all else by being perceived as “hardworking,” “trustworthy,” “a good person,” and offering what little resources one might have to others. Such reputation is secured and reinforced by willing and public display of participation in family, village, and communal events in general. Thus, all producers and others in the district are involved in ongoing discourses within and about community and shared identity. My findings thus suggest that business associations and IPs – integral to new economic models for local cooperation in Peru – unexpectedly provide arenas for debate over unfair alliances that exclude more marginalized producers, suggesting opportunities for collective renegotiation for how community-based projects are implemented.

What this dissertation ultimately shows is that people of various degrees of economic and political disadvantage in Quinoa are capable of exercising agency, of influencing the influential, and for constructing purpose and meaning in their relationships with social others. However, I also suggest that these potential capacities are routinely frustrated and diverted by the workings of multi-scalar inequities and the development apparatuses through which norms and values are channeled. Too, there is a danger in assuming that people can use social connections and cultural assets to move out of positions of disadvantage: if local people are not perceived as capitalizing on these assets according to standards of programmatic schemes for development, they bear the responsibility and blame their own deficit of “community” and social capital, as well as their own economic marginalization.

In Latin America, development organizations actively promote new forms of neoliberal development. The goal is to increase competition, improve efficiency and integrate rural and indigenous populations into national economies. What we find, however, is that local and

longstanding socioeconomic structures actually coopt these new forms of organization. People working in the artisan industry in Quinoa, Peru, in particular, perceive the benefits of associations and collective product branding because they are one among few options for gaining a stable source of cash. Not all, however, have the material and symbolic resources to take advantage of these development opportunities, and tensions arise from varying degrees of capacity to engage development. At the same time, then, artisan workers express frustration and hesitancy towards intentional development projects. Ultimately, rather than enabling inclusive development and improved livelihood opportunities for local communities, these neoliberal forms actually increase internal divisions through competition over the development programs themselves. I argue in the following chapters that reconsidering how people differently use and construct their social networks and cultural assets for production and marketing is crucial for understanding increasing inequality and differentiation. This kind of approach enables me to critically examine how social relationships and access to cultural resources enable or constrain the livelihoods of the people I worked with in Peru, and what “room for maneuver” they have within existing social structures. It also facilitates our understandings of processes of inclusion and exclusion, and the limits to the supposedly emancipatory and democratic possibilities of community-based development interventions aimed at promoting public engagement and cultural representation.

CHAPTER 2

QUINUA IN NATIONAL AND GLOBAL CRAFT MARKETS

Ceramic Producers in the Local Setting

The cramped ride to Quinua in the *combi* (minivan taxi)—smelling of car exhaust and dried sweat—had left me exhausted. The marketplace, across the street from the *paradero* (bus stop), included one of the three tourist restaurants in town, the food vendor stalls (of *chicharón*, *choclo*, *queso*, *pan chapla*, *la sopa de chuño*, *mate de anís*, etc.) and a rundown basketball court where people flocked on Sundays for the weekly market. Seven stalls and a cement ditch marking the narrow boundary between the roadway and food stalls offered souvenirs – ceramics, carved *Piedra de Huamanga*, woven wool and cotton hats and scarves – to wandering tourists looking to pick up a quick gift for a family member. (I later found out that many of these items for sale were bought in the market in Ayacucho or other town centers of the district, though “Quinua” was embroidered onto their edges.) These stalls were strategically positioned outward towards the road so as to attract any tourist either just beginning their tour of Quinua or meandering in the market area, waiting for the next *combi* to take them back to the city of Ayacucho.

With the high Andean sun forcing me to cover my eyes with my hand, I dragged myself up the cobblestone stairway leading away from the *paradero* and to the central plaza. The *Plaza Principal* of the district of Quinua, located at the top of an incline away from the main roadway for cargo trucks and *combis*, is home to the municipality of Quinua, the town church, and the local police who sometimes idly patrolled around observing my wonderings

with vague curiosity. I scribbled notes on the social scene at the plaza, noting what people wore, whether they spoke in Spanish or Quechua (older women and men tended to speak Quechua), and where they seemed to be walking. Next to the municipality, a museum housed a few artifacts from the famous Battle of Ayacucho of 1824 and not much else. I saw two tourists filter in and out during that afternoon I sat on a bench, its paint peeling, in the main plaza.

Whitewashed cement and adobe buildings fashioned in the typical colonial architectural style, lined the four main paths leading from the plaza corners as if nestling in for the impending night cold. They foregrounded a sweeping mountainscape and blue sky that yawned wide above the town. In the doorways of homes, inhabitants had stretched out pieces of blue woven textiles with *choclo* (a native corn), *chuño* (freeze-dried potatoes), and *alberjas* (fava beans) spread out and drying in the sun. It was a Monday, the day after the busy Sunday market, and the streets were generally free of people aside from the few strollers and laborers carrying on their backs heavy loads of potatoes or eucalyptus branches for firewood. The barrenness of the pathways winding through the center was commonplace in Quinoa; public crowds and bustling streets occurred on special occasions, mostly during local *fiestas* and on Sundays.

A couple artisan shops dotting the corners of the plaza were virtually closed the entire length of my stay, aside from the two days of national holiday in early July, which brought a large number of tourists primarily from Lima. The many weathered ceramic churches and flower vases fastened on housetops further attested to the longstanding existence of potters, though none were in sight. This somewhat clandestine nature

(sometimes intentional, sometimes not) of pottery making also marked the everyday rhythm of life and livelihoods in Quinua.

A few women were settled on the edge of the cobble-stoned pathway, some chewing coca, others tending to their *tiendas* or small children wrapped tightly in brightly colored *lliqllas*. An older woman approached me and spoke to me in Quechua, most of which I did not understand, except that she asked me where I had come from and what I was doing in town. She switched to a broken Spanish that mirrored my broken Quechua, suggesting that I come home with her to meet her son. “You can bring him to your *pueblo*,” the woman affirmed, and, as if to sweeten the pot, she added, “My grandkids will have blue eyes.” I laughed a little uncomfortably, recognizing that her joke, meant for establishing friendship, also carried serious undertones that I heard others speak explicitly: “Somos pobres. Ustedes tienen plata, no? [We’re poor. You all have money, no?” Though rarely said with malice, the differences in wealth and livelihood opportunities were a constant source of conversation between me and the inhabitants of Quinua and between themselves.

<<< >>>

This chapter introduces the district of Quinua and its inhabitants. It describes the different kinds of relationships within and between households as well as other social networks – based on kinship, *compadrazgo* (ritual kinship), shared labor, co-residence, gender norms, wealth. It examines how these deep and abiding obligations of family and community have their own forms of exclusion and hierarchy. Throughout this dissertation, I argue that tensions exist between different forms of cooperation and competition, between collective good and personal gain, that shapes how people engage with development projects. As I mentioned in the introduction, people working in craft production do not all have the same degree or kind of

economic, cultural, and symbolic resources to take advantage of these development projects. As expressed through the structure of business associations (Chapter 3) and local strategies of aesthetic appropriation and product branding (Chapter 4), these complex and changing relationships within the district of Quinua and beyond, which producers and families move into, through, and out of, are marked by power relations and conflict. Thus, it is important to situate new practices and relations structuring development projects as part of historically situated and ongoing processes of social differentiation that shape and are shaped by the nexus of traditional relationships of production and exchange. As Roseberry has argued, “While new [economic and social relations] are part of wider processes of capital accumulation, they are introduced in local spaces with earlier relations, which may be ‘noncapitalist’ or may represent the sedimentation of earlier periods of capital accumulation” (2002:64). What I show then is that current neoliberal models, even as they promote inclusive development, have in fact become coopted by existing social hierarchies through traditional exclusionary forms of organization, and social inequality. Not taking into account the complexity of the local political and moral economic processes thus obstructs any attempt at intentional collective and community undertakings.

By acknowledging that social relationships are dynamic, changing over time or even lapsing, I am building on the work of anthropologists who view naturalized social forms – e.g., gender, household, community – as the shifting outcomes of social and political processes, rather than as fixed social units (Alber 1999; Narotzky and Smith 2006; Nash 2001; O’Brien and Roseberry 1991; Sider 1986; G. Smith 1989; Wolf 2010 [1982]). These writers critically analyze how people use their stock of knowledge, values, and preexisting interpretative frameworks to negotiate and maneuver within changing circumstances, and further how these circumstances themselves are the product of historical struggle. This perspective allows me to

reveal how certain social forms, like those of “artisan” and “community,” are the products of particular processes operating in specific social fields.²³

In contrast to earlier Andean scholarship, which tended towards an imposed “Otherness” of *lo Andino* on communities in the Andes (see Starn 1994), I insist on the historically and contextually contingent nature of *comunidad* (community) and other collective and cooperative forms. “Put another way,” as anthropologist Gavin Smith suggests, “the forms and imperatives of the social collectivities pertinent to any particular subject at a given time and place, are likely to vary immensely – from neighborhood to factory, from ‘community’ to family, from union to beer-parlour – and with such variance different issues regarding political expression need attention” (Smith 1999:40). I thus follow scholars like Smith, who insist on exploring the implications of different historical processes in considering how localities come into being and are reproduced through time. In doing so, I find that the use made of the notion of “community” and “artisan” by recent policymakers and project planners is confused and, more important, prevents people from going on to more critical insights, because these terms act as surrogates for a more analytical kind of history.

The District of Quinua

From the perspective of the nation-state, the town proper of Quinua (referred to Quinuenos as the *centro* or *pueblo*) is the capital of the district bearing the same name and a subdivision of the Huamanga Province, which is, in turn, a subdivision of the Department of Ayacucho. This town center is also the central nexus of district activities, such as the major bus

²³ William Roseberry (1989), for instance, focuses on political economies of communities, emphasizing their stratified and contentious elements. For him, the peasant community is “a political association formed through processes of political and cultural creation and imagination” (1989:14).

stop, small restaurants and food stalls, principal market held on Sundays, and artisan vendors. The *municipio*, or “urban” government, of Quinoa, through which the nation-state exercises its basic authority, works from offices located in the central town. Under the jurisdiction of the *municipio* are twenty-four outlying *anexo* (annex or hamlet) settlements, each of which are referred to by the inhabitants of the district as *comunidades* and presided over by the Communal President (Navarro Ramos 2005).²⁴ Only three of the populated centers – Lorensayocc, Anansayocc, and Muruncancha – in Quinoa are legally registered *comunidades campesinas*.^{25 26} While the dual barrio political divisions of Lorensayocc and Anansayocc constitute the immediate environs of the Quinoa town center, each is registered as having respective annexes and communal lands. Each once had separate rural political organizations (*varayoc*), but are now only organized by separate irrigation systems and alternate in holding annual religious celebrations (W. Mitchell 1972, 1976a, 1976b). While this dual system has been found in other parts of the Andes, and around which many people establish their identity, this dual division no longer constitutes in Quinoa the most important foundation to contemporary identification. Local people in Quinoa most often refer to the official *comunidades campesinas* as *barrios*, employing the term *comunidad campesina* to a legal and political entity.

The district of Quinoa (3,270 meters above sea level) lies in the *quechua* (temperate) climatic zone, at the transition from cacti and thorny scrub to humid woodland (Arnold 1972a, 1972b, 1985, 1993; W. Mitchell 1991, 1999; Tschopik 1947). Its rolling countryside stretches

²⁴ The 2007 INEI census reported forty-three *centros poblados* for the District of Quinoa, of which twenty-four are the *anexos* and one is the town center. Most of the remaining sixteen populated centers that people in Quinoa do *not* recognize locally as *comunidades* have less than ten domestic units.

²⁵ Comunidad de Lorensayocc con Resolución Suprema S/N con fecha 03 de enero de 1940. Comunidad de Anansayocc con Resolución Suprema S/N con fecha 03 de enero de 1940. Comunidad de Muruncancha con Resolución Directoral 098-CETAR-AYA-DRA con fecha 07 de octubre de 1998 (Perú Posible 2010).

²⁶ In Andean anthropology, the *comunidad campesina* is one of the most highly studied institutions (Alberti and Mayer 1974; Golte 1992; Mayer 2002; Murra 1975). It refers to a historically situated political designation.

upward and to the east of the mountain wall framing the northeastern slopes of the Ayacucho Valley; it reaches downward and to the west into a vast ravine along whose bottom the Chaqo river winds its distant way to the Pacific coast. The Ayacucho Valley itself is characterized by sharply crested ridges and deeply eroded valleys, which frequently have broad smooth stretches relatively suitable for cultivation. This landscape covers much of what was once a “vertical archipelago” (Murra 1972, 1985a, 1985b),²⁷ but complex transformations in Quinuenos’ involvement in national and international markets, including craft markets, wage labor, migration, and other more broad political and economic processes have weakened the archipelago.

Of the district’s 6,115 inhabitants, less than forty percent (2,340 people) live in the urban zone, primarily covering the town center and the Lorensayocc and Anansayocc *comunidades campesinas*.²⁸ The remaining 3,775 inhabitants live in one of the outlying annexes, or community hamlets. As in many rural villages and towns in the Andes, the household in Quinua, rather than the person, is the central social and economic unit, historically and present-day (see Mayer 2002; Salomon 2004:180). At the same time, however, households are articulated in diverse and fluid ways with and within kinship networks, community hamlets within the district, and the *comunidad campesina*. Importantly, where people focused their sense of shared belonging, memory, and identity was contingent, and historically so, on this nexus of

²⁷ In the Andes, scholars like Murra (1972), have shown how farmers frequently minimized risk by diversifying crops to exploit vertically located microclimates (termed vertical archipelago). In present-day Quinua, the economic practices and political organization significantly differ from the Inca vertical archipelago model described by Murra and others for the Andes. For an excellent scholarly application of the analytical concepts of, but still maintaining flexibility within, the model, to modern Andean towns and communities see Colloredo-Mansfeld 1999:120-62.

²⁸ The 2005 Plan Estrategico de Desarrollo – Quinua 2005-2010 estimates that over three-fourths of the population lived in the rural zone of the district in 2004. This number still reflects a vast majority of people living in rural zones of Quinua today.

relationships.²⁹ In particular, the meanings that actors, whether members of the community, NGO workers, or politicians or bureaucrats, placed on one or more kinds of relationships is culturally, historically and politically shaped.

Significant capital accumulation has taken place in Quinua, although on a small scale and mostly concentrated in the town center. Most families in Quinua produce food (potatoes, corn, fava beans, squash) in their own fields, but rarely have enough land to achieve self-sufficiency. Although virtually every family sells or exchanges surplus produce or other foodstuffs on occasion (usually in small quantities with neighbors or during Sunday markets), only a few townspeople produce crops or raise livestock in any commercially significant way. Ultimately, all families build livelihoods through diverse strategies (e.g., agricultural and unskilled wage labor, food vending, providing transportation services, migration and remittances from migrants, and craft production). As one, more prominent strategy, ceramic production and sale is the largest source of cash for about one-fourth of the population (about 1,200 people) in Quinua (Municipalidad Distrital de Quinua 2001). Providing some degree of regularity, more so than other cash-earning activities, ceramics further allows many families to remain living and working in their home community centers. Ceramic production, while very much an activity motivated by economic disadvantage, is also compelling for other reasons involving values that are not strictly utilitarian or market-based.

Today nearly every family has some member who works primarily in craft manufacture, trade, or related activity (e.g., selling firewood for kilns or clay from their land). The number of

²⁹ My understanding of processes of identity making draws from the work of Strathern (1988) and Kearney (1996). The multiple and overlapping relations in which people are mutually engaged constitute aspects of their identities. As a person-in-community, or more so person-in-communities, craftworkers draw upon these different facets of his or her identity within a complex nexus of membership in diverse collectives. Within this shifting social milieu of mutual relationships, artisans likewise exhibit complex, and often shifting, subject identities. Identities then, as Sokefeld (1999) argues, are plural, conflicting, context dependent, competing, antagonistic and intersecting (419-423). See also Taylor (1989, 2002) for comparison.

people working the ceramic trade in the entire district of Quinua fluctuates given how often people shift between artisan production and other temporary employments throughout a person's lifetime. Importantly, although work in the ceramic industry does provide some economic alternatives, the work is extremely poorly paid and notoriously insecure, particularly for wagedworkers. The work also tends to be highly gendered and locally dispersed. At least for some, this form of petty capitalism has provided a way to place one's self in a better position when contrasted with dependent workers and unemployed people in Quinua, but the majority of production has historically been dominated by four family enterprises.

Virtually all potters claim their own family heritage of pottery production, emphasizing that their knowledge has been passed down from father to children, from husbands to wives, from brother to brother.³⁰ The case of an artisan, age forty-two, who I will call Felipe, is illustrative in this regard. In 2009, as I waited for a taxi at the *paradero* in Ayacucho to carry me to Quinua, I unexpectedly ran into Felipe who I met the previous year. I had not been to Peru in over a year, and I was surprised when I turned to hop into an idling taxi and recognized Felipe (who I thought was a fulltime potter) as the driver.

The previous year in 2008, Felipe had effusively related to me his family history in which, he claimed (and still does), the Quinua ceramic tradition is deeply rooted; he asserted that it was his great-great grandfather who was compelled by a sorcerer to form the first pot in Quinua. Thereafter, the great-great grandfather continued making pottery, teaching his children in the process. This exchange of knowledge between generations, persisting to the present day, expressed a material and symbolic relationship between the people involved. Furthermore in 2008, Felipe and his wife, who I will call Gloria, had kindly invited me to participate in the

³⁰ Adult men tend to occupy primary roles of hand molding and design creation while women usually assist in shining and painting the work of their father or husband.

entire pottery making process, from traveling to the bottom of a ravine to mine raw clay to the firing and painting phases. Their kindness as well as commitment to ceramic making had stood out to me because they had completed this process in two days, when normally it takes a week or more, and had done so without asking for anything in return.

Back at the taxi, Felipe, too, was surprised as he slowly recognized me as the *gringa* tourist who had spent two days with him and his wife. Of course, he insisted, I would ride in his taxi at no cost. In order to reciprocate his kindness, I bought a bag of fresh *pan chapla* (locally made bread) and locally made cheese before heaving myself into the cramped space of the passenger seat. I recall being energized at the chance encounter, though later I discovered it was not as odd as I had thought. It was certainly common for men, even ceramicists, in Quinua to operate a taxi service at some point in their lives and the *paradero* in Ayacucho offered the most business. As Felipe and I chatted, his 1993 silver Toyota station wagon lurching up and around the curves of the extremely twisty road to Quinua. I soon found out that Felipe purchased the station wagon so that he could offer a taxi service when he was not making ceramics. He explained that he needed the extra cash in order to afford sending his two children (ages 11 and 14) to school in Lima. Within that hour-long trip to Quinua, Felipe too had invited me to stay in his home with him and Gloria, to which I eagerly agreed. Their home (also a workshop and tourist shop) was centrally located in the town center. Felipe's family was, furthermore, one of the most well known Quinua potter families in the country.

My experience with Felipe and Gloria during the next few weeks keyed me into one critical understanding of local realities for making a living while also making them meaningful: intertwining narratives of traditional family relationships were reinforcing narratives of economic subsistence and *superarse* (getting ahead). During that period, I lived and worked

alongside Walter and Delia, first helping with daily tasks (e.g., cooking, polishing ceramics) and later taking notes in the evenings as we sat around watching Mexican sitcoms, such as *Chavo*, before eating dinner. They had set up a makeshift room on the bottom floor of their home using a piece of thin plywood stood on its edge to separate their ceramic shop from my new bedroom – complete with a bedframe and mattress. The kitchen, dining area, and their bedroom occupied the second floor.

During my stay, Felipe continued with his taxi service, usually in the afternoons, while he and Gloria would sat in the mornings working with their clay to build small clay churches and animal figures. Felipe described his wife as his business partner, since she not only took a direct role in the creation of innovative designs that she herself produced in clay, but she also managed the gallery and sale of pieces. At the same time that many potters defined their pottery work by relationships linking husband and wife, parents and children, and siblings, incomes from production were never constant and could not be relied on alone for cash flows.

Pulling together wages, farming, and craft profits that may come from the more rural Andean highlands or middlemen in Lima, Quinoa exemplify the dynamic Andean cultural worlds described by anthropologist Orin Starn, places where “the intensified rhythms of intermixture and mobility have created dizzying proliferation of differences” (1994:19, cited in Colloredo-Mansfeld 2002:115). Still, shades of anxiety tinge this mobility and intermixture. According to Peru’s National Institute of Statistics and Informatics (INEI) – which measures poverty levels in terms of the *Canasta básica de consumo* (basic consumption needs of a person),³¹ 85% of the Quinoa population (6,115 people) is classified as living in poverty, and

³¹ Poverty lines are based on the basic consumption needs of a person, which in the case of Peru is 2,318 kilocalories per day. This measurement is considered more accurate than the measurement of poverty based on unsatisfied basic needs (housing, electronic equipment, etc.), which consider variable criteria. For instance, the basic needs in urban

more than half of this number in extreme poverty. Located in Ayacucho, one of the poorest regions in the country, the Quinua district is recorded in official reports as having the fourth highest poverty rate for the region (INEI 2009). Local people's narratives and conversations were permeated with discourses of *pobreza* (poverty) coupled with descriptions of the material conditions of disadvantage, such as lack of education and the scarcity of reliable cash-earning activities. These discourses were important to the claims people make on each other as well as how they position themselves in relation to development projects and state resources as well as multifarious forms of community.

In the next section, I explore how people take part in, at the same time as they construct, *comunidad*. I make clear that the term "community" can be used to refer to different forms of local collectivity apart from the state-authorized *comunidad campesina*. These various forms of collectivity and community belonging are, at once, a form and product of historically contingent struggle (Roseberry 1989, 1991).

Mi comunidad: The Political Economy of Community in Quinua

When people in Quinua employ the phrase *mi comunidad* (my community), they were most often, in fact, referring to the social and physical space of annexes, or, as I call them in this dissertation, community hamlets. "Why not visit *mi comunidad*, senorita? My wife will cook food of the *campo*," I countless people suggested as I walked through the town center. "The fiesta for *yarqa aspiy* in *mi comunidad* is next week," others commented when I indicated I had attended a similar fiesta in another hamlet. More poignantly, people asserted in some fashion, "I want something better for *mi comunidad*. The *municipio* only gives support to *el pueblo*."

areas are different from those in rural areas. Basic consumption needs calculated in relation to poverty lines of USD 74.3~42.1. For more information on the methodology of measurement see <http://www.inei.gob.pe>.

Importantly, people in Quinoa refer to these practices as “*de mi/nuestra comunidad*” (of my/our community). In describing and acting through these forms of practices of *comunidad*, they did not refer to a general or abstract moral order or reciprocity but instead stressed the on-the-ground inter-dependence between people. This distinction becomes important when trying to understand how artisans and people in Quinoa generally talk about producing ceramics or doing other activities “together.” People reference not just a collective effort for common objectives but to their mutual need and desires as well as obligations, and the fact that they themselves and their actions in moments in which they are preformed are intertwined (Magazine 2011). Given that they share a common objective in a particular moment, according to Anthony P. Cohen (1985), “does not imply necessarily that people perceive an exact identity of interest between themselves and their community. It could simply be that the community provides them with a model for political formulation of their interests and aspirations” (107). The everyday and ceremonial rituals referenced by such individuals exemplify the kinds of public and social discursive practices through which people publicly and socially define themselves as a community.

In their respective community hamlets of residence, too, all households are obliged to contribute labor toward work teams (*faenas*) devoted to communal work projects, especially for the cleaning of canals (*varqa aspiy*). By initiating communal works to benefit the inhabitants of each communal center, the authorities try to establish some kind of lasting reputation among the people of their political orbit. These authorities of the outlying annexes attempt this not only through organizing work teams for communal projects but also by petitioning the district’s *alcalde* for financial assistance for projects as well as acting as the voice of the communal center during community meetings held in the town center primarily on Sundays. In this way, the people of Quinoa pressure the *alcalde* of the district in particular to initiate public works in their

respective communal centers since it is the job of the *alcalde* to run the physical unit of the district, e.g. the upkeep of roads and public buildings, the administration of municipal revenue, and the control of the central market and kiosks. For people producing ceramics, this tendency is particularly important since a shared sense of belonging has tended not to center on a shared understanding of the trade, but as members of their respective community hamlets.

Simultaneously, the particularities of this socio-spatial organization are foundational to the local political economy in Quinoa. Inhabitants made distinctions between the inhabitants living in the town center, called *vecinos* (neighbors), and those living in the rural community hamlets, called *campesinos* (peasants) (see also Arnold 1993:32 and Mitchell 1991). *Vecinos* tended to speak Spanish more fluently, relied less on agricultural subsistence, and dressed in a westernized fashion, such as jeans. Wealthier adults who were born into the position were often referred to as *gente decente* (decent people), who people often described as *de corbata* (“of a tie,” referencing the dress of a suit and tie). *Campesinos* were associated with not being able to read, write, and fluently speak Spanish, and primarily spoke Quechua; they relied primarily on subsistence farming. *Ajotas* (rubber-tire sandals) and broad-rimmed hats marked most adult *campesinos*, while *campesino* women typically wore double-layered knee-length skirts, a plain blouse and colorful shawl.

While these distinctions might appear clear from an objective point of view, subjective characterizations of people reflect fluidity, variability, and flexibility. In other words, people “occupy a shifting place in the hierarchy, depending on who is evaluating whom” (Mitchell 2006:54; see also Mitchell 1976a, 1976b, de la Cadena 2000:223-25, and Seligmann 2004:129-30, 148-60). “Yenni,” an artisan friend and *compadre* pointed out while we were sharing a bottle of beer to celebrate his brother’s birthday, “I only drink when there’s a special occasion. I don’t

drink just to drink... like in the *campo*.” His voice grew loud, as he repeated himself, “I don’t drink just for anything. Ask my wife. I’m educated. My children are educated. We’re people of culture. My wife, she doesn’t chew coca. I only chew it if I’m in the *campo* for a fiesta.” “Why don’t you chew coca?” I asked. “Campesinos chew coca,” the artisan finished. From the perspective of this artisan, his family was well mannered, “decent people” while campesinos were “uneducated” and crude. Certainly, he was a rich townspeople to his rural kin, as they consistently asked him step in as *padrino* of an *arranza* or *zafacasa*, for which he would contribute beer and music. Many townspeople, however, considered him a drunk and irresponsible father, citing that he never helped with household duties and almost entirely stopped working in ceramics. As this last comment suggests, too, and which I will discuss in further depth in the next section, these hierarchies of status and wealth, mediated partly by the developing relationships between town center and community hamlet, were also foundational to the social relations of production and reproduction in ceramic making.

Current Dynamics underpinning Ceramic Production Today

Bathed in hazy sunlight pouring in from the grimy window of his workshop, Antonio Suarez (age forty-four) was teaching me how to smooth the bottom of an *urpi* (traditional marriage bowl). His sixteen-year old son, Jaziel, was also making an *urpi* but exhibiting far more skill than the *gringa* novice. Like Jaziel, I had to turn with one hand a small, heavy metal pottery wheel, where my clay work-in-progress rested, at a constant rate. My other hand steadied a *palo* (smooth wooden stick) to catch air bubbles and excess clay and generally smooth out inconsistencies from the walls of the *urpi* plate. Unlike Jaziel, my hands were unsteady, and I made far more scuffs in the wet clay than with what I had started. Antonio looked on, nodding

with vague approval on occasion. During these lessons, which I came to understand as “learning-by-doing,” Antonio gave me little verbal instruction; he would demonstrate a technique (e.g. smoothing out the bottom of a bowl, filling a plaster mold, varnishing a dried plate, etc.), and I would mimic his movements over and over again, improving a little more every time. Along with Jaziel, we scraped the reddish-gray slippery clay off onto the side of plastic water buckets as Antonio checked both of our work, correcting any detail he found not of his standards.

For Antonio, and most artisans in Quinua, the contemporary space of production was simultaneously the domestic space. Whether workshops were set up in a space that served another purpose (e.g., storage facility, kitchen) or in a room or structure adjacent to the home reflected, in part, levels of income of the producer and his household. Artisans with home-workshops, both Antonio and Roberto (opening of Chapter 1) among them, tended to earn less from ceramic sales, while artisans with stand-alone-workshops (Felipe and Gloria among them) tended to earn more. To give a sense of Antonio’s situation, he lived, with his wife and four children, in a bi-level adobe brick house that lacked running water, gas stove, and television set that were present in the home of Felipe and Gloria. He was working at the time making over 2,000 small clay banks using a plaster mold twelve hours a day, contracted to be finished in two months. Antonio recognized the tediousness of the work, saying that payment for this project is barely enough to support his family. The client for this request agreed to give Antonio 675 soles (about 225 dollars) for two months. This is below the average gain of 400 to 700 soles (133 to 233 dollars) per month quoted by other ceramicists. During those days reserved for lessons in clay, Antonio spoke, although reservedly so, of his work as a step toward improving the wellbeing of his children – that his family might have a little more food, or, at least, for his

children, notebooks and pencils for school. Jaziel showed promise, Antonio mentioned, in carrying on the family business. He held this hope even though he had experienced a lesser degree of economic success compared to, for example, Gloria and Felipe, who I was still staying with at that time in 2009.

Among the basic features of these sort of domestic enterprises³² for making pottery, whether they were workshops set apart or home-workshops, in Quinua was the fact that they were small entities consisting of one individual, most often working with family labor. Wives and domestic partners worked in molding pieces with plaster models which they then helped fire, paint, and polish (if necessary), while children between the ages ten and fifteen tended to help with lighter tasks, like loading kilns. When asked to describe the work performed by these family members, both artisans and family members, women and men, referred to these family members as *ayudantes* (helpers) and employed the term *ayudar* (to help). Women, for the most part, worked primarily in molding with plaster molds, painting smaller details (e.g. figures' faces, flowers, face of clocks on churches, the tiny additions that made certain features give a piece "more real"). When I asked people to describe what tasks different people perform in ceramics, male speakers tended to say of themselves *yo hago* (I make) and of their domestic partner *me ayuda* (she helps me) while female speakers described their partners' work in terms of *el hace* and their own as *le ayuda* (I help him or her). A (male) artisan, for instance, once told me, "Molds are for women, for my wife, for my sister-in-law. I don't use molds. I use my hands." From this discursive framing, it seems clear that, locally, men make and women help. This division of labor was thus based on unequally valued and gendered material activities

³² I employ the term "enterprise" to loosely mean a project or undertaking, typically one that requires some degree of scope, complication, and risk; a systematic purposeful activity.

involved in producing for markets. Men implicitly and explicitly recognized the importance of women's labor in production, but they tended to not value it the same as their own.

Women, however, were very often the interface between producer and buyer, negotiating prices and exchanging products for cash. For families living in the town center, women tended also to manage prices and made sales to tourists and other clients in the family gallery or in rented kiosks in the town marketplace. Those who handled this aspect of the family business tended to know far more than men about how to price an item based on size, quality of finish, comparison of prices with other ceramics goods sold by others. Many of these women, in fact, were known for their ruthless negotiation of prices with buyers, and women recognized this influence they often have in the marketplace. A woman once described to me how one day she left her husband at home to tend the store, while she traveled to Ayacucho; her daughter, who usually helps her mother tend the store, was still in classes at the time. Her husband, she claimed, sold several pieces to tourists passing through at prices below what they normally sell for – he even sold a couple pieces more than twenty sols less. “My [daughter],” she explained as she laughed at the ignorance of her husband, “knows the prices even, and even the tourists said to him, ‘How do you not know the prices of your own work, Senor?!’.” Another woman, when I asked how she negotiates prices when contracting another artisan, said, “You can’t back down. You have to stick to your price, or they’ll take advantage of you. You’ll go one day and give them one price, and then when you go to collect the order, they’ll have changed the price.”

Women were expected to help in the production process and watch the family shop without pay, while children were often given their *propina* (tip, pocket change) (which they may use to buy pens, snacks, or to use the internet). Children spent some of their free time helping with light tasks (e.g., painting, selling, stocking the shop, and loading kilns), using their *propina*

to buy candy, small toys, or colorful notebooks on their own. As in many artisan families found in other parts of the world, women in Quinua performed the bulk of domestic duties alongside pottery production (see Ehlers 1982, 2000; Nash 1993). Women found that juggling children, cooking, and cleaning with income-producing activities was often onerous. The commitment of women to their families and homes, however, rather than to wage employment meant that their complaints and struggles regarding the burden of double-shift work was phrased in terms of moral issues. Several women confided that they often hid cash earned from ceramic sales from their husbands if they thought he would use it on non-family related expenses (e.g., alcohol, playing cards, etc.). One of the more extreme cases involved Antonio and his wife Jimena.

In October of 2010, when I had returned to Quinua again having been absent for a year, I found Antonio's wife, Jimena, working one the food stalls across from the *paradero*.

"Buenos dias, Senora Jimena!" I cheerily called out, "Do you remember me? I visited you and your husband last year at your home. I study ceramics." The woman inspected my face as she racked her memory.

"Ahhh! *La gringa! La gringuita!* How are you? I remember I asked you to be my daughter's godmother," she replied with renewed animation.

"I'm very well, thank you. How are you and your husband?" I said. The woman's brow furrowed and her smile disappeared. She was noticeably troubled by my question.

"My husband, he went to the jungle. He's left," she said. Not immediately understanding the weight of what Jimena was saying, I sat down on the bench of a wood picnic table inside her stand and asked her when he would return. She began to cry, saying he was never coming back.

On that afternoon, I was faced with the real troubles that so often go hand-in-hand with erratic and unstable job opportunities in Latin American countries, especially in rural areas. Jimena described how her husband, Antonio, had left his home in Quinua to find new work in the jungle region nearly a seven-hour *combi* ride northeast over mountainous terrain. She had been left to care for her four children, three of which were still in school. Her fourth, Jimena lamented, Jaziel worked from time to time in ceramics. “Only to drink... for his beer,” she added. A couple women occupying neighboring stalls came over, and we all sat with Jimena while she expressed her distress over not knowing how she would be able to feed her children – let alone send them to school. She feared too her husband had already taken up with another woman in the jungle. “I’m alone,” she repeated, “I’m alone.” Since that afternoon, I have not seen Antonio, though I have heard he is no longer working in ceramics.

As the example of Antonio and Jimena suggests, ceramic production, and social and economic life in general, in Quinua were marked by hope as well as distress, family togetherness and family conflict, struggle and small achievements. Importantly, people and families experienced these in different degrees, where the weight of hardship bears down unequally. Indeed, for a handful of families in Quinua, ceramic production for tourist and export markets allowed for other activities previously not advantageous. Others, however, experienced real difficulties in making ends meet, as they struggled to decide whether to stay working a family and community tradition, or take up a potentially more profitable venture. Even those who seemed committed to the craft fulltime for both economic and cultural reasons sought out other opportunities. That same day I learned of Antonio’s departure, for instance, I had also learned of Felipe and Gloria’s departure to Lima. While they left together in order to live closer to their children (still in school) and Gloria’s ailing father, Felipe, like Antonio, had also felt that ceramic

making in Quinoa simply could not financially sustain his family, especially with his children going to more expensive schools in Lima. Felipe, however, still continued making ceramics, albeit in smaller volumes than previously, and also had the social networks (they live with Gloria's sister) to be able to make the transition. Felipe and Gloria's capacity to draw on these social assets also meant reinforcing those same connections, as Gloria was then able to take care of her ailing father while also living close to her children. We have, then, two producers and their families who were differently positioned in terms of access to economic and cultural resources but whose struggles reflected similar characteristics.

Based on these sorts of case comparisons, it is possible to delineate artisans according to their primary economic activity in pottery production as well as the particular nature of their productive relationships. These labor relations of dominance and subordination combined direct and indirect elements. The exploitation of labor was mediated by local cultural forms, which were often controlled by local elites and simultaneously mediums of community solidarity. The ideology of gender, family, and work ethic, which resulted in unremunerated work for women and children, also pulled together father, mother, and children in home production. Extended and ritual kin were also integrated into this system, further opening the way for labor exchanges.

I have separated ceramic producers into three primary types: artisans-businessman, artisan-independent, and artisan-peasant. I found prominent in Quinoa class dynamics between people who identified as *artesano-campesino* and those who identified as strictly *artesano* who I break down into *empresarios* and *independientes*. Artisan-peasants tended to live in one of the outlying community hamlets. For their livelihoods, they relied heavily on subsistence farming while also producing ceramics during non-farming hours of the day. Average craft earnings for these producers hovered between fifty and one hundred-fifty soles a month, depending on the

season. Significantly, the areas where these producers lived are described by Quinua inhabitants as *lo mas pobre* (the poorest). They were viewed as having different goals than full-time artisans. “*Los del campo* [Those of the countryside] make ceramics here and there, for the local tourist market. They have to think about their *chakra* too,” one self-described artisan-businessman described, “I want to learn how to export to France and Italy. I want to sell in large quantities.”

By contrast, the majority of people identifying as artesano-empresario and/or artesano-independiente tended to live in the town center, relied very little on subsistence farming but do sell products from their fields to neighbors or from time to time (if they produce a large quantity) in markets in Ayacucho. These individuals produced ceramics “full-time,” earning between 200 and 2000 soles a month on average, a few earning up to \$1,500 USD on occasion. These artisans often bought or contracted fired but unpainted pieces from artisan-peasants, and they then turned around and painted the pieces themselves to stock their galleries. These artisans also contracted artisan-peasants, or employed their children (as *peones*), to help complete the occasional large order. These relations of production were also tied by bonds of kin and *compadrazgo* – the same relationships that formed the basis of *ayni* (reciprocal labor exchange for agriculture) and for contributions made when putting on fiestas. Frequently, an individual producer worked through subcontracting portions of an order or the initial production phases. Artisans who owned a tourist shop in the town center, for example, often contracted poorer producers from an outlying community to make a dozen or so molded and fired pieces, which the artisan then painted in his own workshop. Artisan-campesino producers from outlying communities, who often did not have direct access to clientele in the cities of Ayacucho or Lima carry out this subcontract work. The person requesting rarely, if ever, provides the raw material for the work. The latter,

however, would often provide the design and measurements of the item requested, or request a model from the artisan's pre-existing stock.

As I mentioned previously, *peon* and *ayudante* were relevant social-class categories in production relations. Many of these categories overlap, and often conflict, as people laboring in ceramic production take on certain features that may shift in their lifetimes. After immediate family members, the second most common source of labor came from extended family members and neighbors. In contrast to *ayudantes*, however, this social group was frequently referred to as *peones* (peons) as they are paid in cash for each unit of work performed. Much like *peones* who were hired for agricultural work, *peones* in craftwork received lunch from their employer, as they traveled to the employer's workshop to complete the work. *Peones*, unlike domestic partners and wives, performed only tasks in ceramic production, completing only specialized tasks (e.g., painting, molding with a plaster model, or mixing clay), thus effecting a division of labor in some workshops.

Another layer of social and political dynamics to artisan production involved the marketing and consumption of products. Most families sold their products to local artisans or tourists, while less than ten sold to vendors or export companies in Lima. If the family business required travel to Ayacucho city or Lima (to visit potential buyers, travel to artisan fairs, or turn in completed orders to clients), men usually undertook these trips.

The perceived benefits of these sorts of relationships with family members, neighbors and friends were strongly balanced by obvious limitations and constraints of such relationships and restrictions of agency that these entailed. When probed, many relationships with neighbors appeared inequitable and closer to clientage arrangements than to friendships. This particularly applied to arrangements between artisans who produced fulltime and artisans who split their time

between ceramic production and agricultural production. The following case reflects ambiguous partnerships that regularly involved conflict and collaboration.

Jorge Velarde began working with his father at twelve years of age and eventually set up an independent workshop in his home next door. Although Jorge claimed ownership of this home/workshop space, his father insisted, often frustratingly, that he rented it from him at less-than-market price. “He’s never even given me any money for it!” Jorge’s mother would often yell at him when she had been drinking. Jorge’s success came from a combination of his father’s regional fame as a traditional potter and from his ability to “make friends” in Ayacucho who regularly bought from him. With or without secure orders, Jorge would then collect raw clay from natural deposits in the local area and prepare a mixture of different clays. Day laborers were hired for mining clay, as were taxi drivers (often Jorge’s soccer friends) to transport the raw clay to his home. Epifania, Jorge’s wife, usually helped him in this process, carrying bags of raw clay, painting and polishing the fired pieces, and finally tending the family’s tourist shop to sell the final products to tourists. Epifania also traveled on foot to households engaged in ceramic making to buy other finished ceramic products in order to diversify the products they offer.

Trust, built from shared work experiences and collaborative practices between producers, may indeed help resolve these sorts of ambiguities in transactions and render opportunism ineffective. But trust, and therefore cooperation, was almost always tentative and unconfirmed for most artisans. Epifania’s attitude reflects this ambivalence:

One day a neighbor will come to us and ask us to make so many pieces so that they can sell them at a fair in Lima, saying, for example, I need five churches and twenty nativity sets, and I will pay you this much for each. We discuss the price... He asks for a discount of 10 soles, and I tell him that the cost is this price and no less. We set the day for when we will turn over the pieces to him, and I say that we need so much of the cash in advance to secure the order. He says he will pay us after we turn the work in... And we make an agreement like this. But this way does not make any sense. Sometimes when we turn the work in, and the work is sold, we still do not get paid. We keep asking for the

money, but it is no use... This person I was talking about before was a friend of Jorge's, they go drinking together, but we cannot trust him to always pay us the price we agreed on. But what can we do?... We have to eat somehow.

A dialectical linkage has emerged between pressures to control other people's behavior and feelings of shared belonging and affective relationships. The uncertainty of insecure futures tied to the market has made these sorts of ambiguous partnerships that much more tentative and potentially exploitative.

Such uncertainty stems from wider historical political and economic processes interacting with local cultural processes such that a commonly shared culture of trust (*confianza*), of "those I can trust" or "those who have claims on me" are called into question (G. Smith and Narotzky 2005:58). The fact that producers in Quinoa have been increasingly more integrated into wider national and global markets has made them more interdependent and therefore highly subject to the uncertainties of worldwide competition. I found in Quinoa a local production system in which very small petty capitalist enterprises supplied local buyers and tourists in a flexible manner, and the buyers supplied the wider global economy with cheaply and quickly made high quality pottery, particularly of an "ethnic" branding (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009; DeHart, 2010). Along with a dispersion of production, however, comes dispersion of risks and impacts of increased competition in oversaturated ceramic markets. Jorge's friend Paulo, as I later found out, owned a workshop where his wife and two children worked (unpaid) as well as up to five additional peons in high production seasons, many of whom were nephews and nieces and neighbors. He was notoriously cited as one who did not pay his workers on time and sometimes not at all, and yet Paulo has managed to attend at least two artisan fairs per year in Lima where he has secured large production orders in the range of \$1,500-\$2,000 direct from buyers abroad.

Talking to Paulo about problems with workers, he explained to me that he cannot rely on most producers to turn his orders on time, much less of a quality he can sell to export buyers. Paulo admitted that occasionally he was not able to pay people for their work, but it was not because he did not want to, but rather buyers often cancelled their orders too late in the production process because they found comparable products elsewhere at a cheaper price (usually from workshops in Lima). In this sense, petty capitalists and workers operating in ceramic manufacture are very much tied into wider circuits of capital through concentric networks of firms, of buyers and sellers, as well as through the increasingly global policy discourse of small enterprise formation.

Dominant neoliberal discourses of local community development, built on shared experiences of work and of place, thus belie material experiences of real-materially and emotionally felt-class divisions and exclusionary practices. This contradiction expressed in daily social interactions in the present makes any claims to “community” problematic.

The Political Economy of Craftwork: Historical Foundations in Ayacucho

The seemingly discrete categories describing different people working in craftwork cannot be taken at face value but must be reevaluated within a series of historical processes and events. Thus, I suggest, artisanship and artisan culture is best comprehended as a complex process of *recontextualization* (Van Leeuwen 2008) in which concepts of *community* and *artisan* have been used in different historical contexts to frame and reframe production practices of certain sectors of the rural population in Peru. As Susana Narotzky and Gavin Smith state:

We must be alert to the danger of falling into the discursive mode of entrepreneurial interest and firm efficiency while obscuring the fundamental ways in which surplus is produced and extracted and the differentiations that are induced and reinforced as a result... The task mandates that we tease out the way ongoing formative practices of

social agents – contradictory, conflictual, and fragmented as they may be – arise out of specific histories in which agency unfolds through narrow cracks between the tectonic plates of the logic of capitalist reproduction... (2005:47-8)

In this section, I trace how the meanings of different material and ideological elements shaping the zone of artisan production and social relationships have undergone processes involving transmutations of values (Appadurai 1986). Extending Appadurai's (1986) "tournaments of value" to cultural property and social assets, diversions of value are found as parts of individual strategies as well as institutionalize in various ways that remove or protect elements of artisanship (e.g., productive relationships, producers and workers, ceramic objects) from relevant social contexts. Examining these slippages as well as conflicts underlying diversions of value sheds light how such exchanges are played out in a matrix of differential power relations. This section, furthermore, contextualizes the cultural discourses and constellations of dispositions through which people operate simultaneously as tools for domination and as vehicles for resistance. This perspective allows me to reveal how certain social forms, like those of "artisan" and "community," are the products of particular processes operating in specific social fields.

Prior to Spanish colonization of the Huamanga Valley (present day Ayacucho) in the early 1500s, the presence of pottery making, mainly a dry-season activity, was quite important to communities. Artisans even employed forms of technology that allowed them to reproduce more rapidly to extend commodity markets (Cook and Benco 2012; Loza 2008; Pozzi-Escot *et al.* 1993). From early on, then, different localities in the Huamanga region specialized in different craftwork, like pot- and cup-making and silverworking. In such localities, specializations, often consisting of a rather limited set of extended families, were likely passed on to the next generation through a system of apprenticeship.

Besides for local domestic and ceremonial use, families made pottery to exchange for subsistence products from neighboring communities. Product exchange (*trueque*) was integral to the vertical archipelago system in Huamanga as it was elsewhere in the central Andes (Murra 1975). Alberti and Mayer (1974:27) argue that when the vertical archipelago system was fragmented and different communities took control of single ecological zones, exchange of products developed.³³ Both systems were important to livelihood as they allowed different Andean communities to access products from several ecological zones and thus diversify subsistence (see Valdez 1997; Mitchell 1976, 1991; Arnold 1975, 1993).³⁴ These forms of exchange and redistribution meant that a community's households and lineages – although marked by inequality, rivalry, and conflict – were necessarily drawn into a cooperative network (Stern 1982:23-24). A full-scale division of labor only partially emerged, being kept in check by the self-sufficiency of households, which required craft specialists to also work lands and animals (Stern 1982:5-14). In places like Quinua, households were responsible for weaving their own clothing and producing their own foods. In this context, property and work relationships alongside identity were inextricably intertwined via webs of belonging, of overlapping bonds of community and kinship, *ayni* exchanges between households and *ayllus*.³⁵

In the early 1500s, upon the arrival of the Spanish conquistadors to Huamanga, the mode of production in local societies was marked less by class contradictions—between community

³³ Valdez 1990:54 suggests that one of the mechanisms was important in one area while the other was practices in another, maybe simultaneously.

³⁴ The above-mentioned products are considered basic for the diet of the inhabitants of the Ayacucho Valley. Yet, they had no “direct control” over ecological zones other than their own. Therefore, exchange is the most effective way to secure products from other ecological zones and to diversify subsistence. Product exchange (*trueque*) is accomplished by the direct contact of the inhabitants of several communities located in different ecological zones (or in the same zone but producing different products). For instance, the inhabitants of the puna exchange potatoes for maize, and those of the lower montane thorn forest exchange maize for chickpeas and salt. (Valdez 1990; Vergara, Arguedas, and Zaga 1983, cited in Valdez 1997:67)

³⁵ See Stern 1982:6-13 for a more detailed discussion.

elites and laboring households—than they were by ethnic divisions. These relations had, however, laid the foundation for a colonial economy built on class divisions laid on top of these preexisting ethnic relations. Historian Steve Stern (1982), in his analysis of Spanish colonization of the Huamanga region,³⁶ traces the processes that ultimately divided native societies into opposed classes, marked by ongoing struggle and conflict, in the period 1532 to 1640. For one, the tastes of the Spanish colonial elites and their imperial courts led to significant demand for luxury foods, clothes, and religious objects. *Encomienda* tributes supplied cities, particularly the Lima capital, Cuzco, and the booming silver-mining city of Potosi, with food, cloth, artisan products,³⁷ and precious medals. Many craft workers from local Indian populations, too, looked to take advantage of new economic opportunities, and while many sought alternative ways to pay tribute to *encomenderos*, many were just as aggressive and open to the burgeoning commercial economy.³⁸ In Huamanga, demand for textiles, in particular, for Spanish imperial courts attracted the attention of business-minded individuals who set up *obrajes*—labor-intensive textile workshops owned by the Crown where there was no pay and working conditions were particularly bad.

The opening up of the commercial economy, and the diversity of economic opportunities in particular, compelled native groups to accommodate new products and skills to local societies’

³⁶ Officially founded by Spanish conquistadors in 1539 (Cieza de Leon) for strategic purposes, the city of Huamanga enjoyed great political and economic importance during this period. The Spanish found it necessary to establish a colony that was loyal to the crown, a permanent garrison to neutralize the military threat posed by Inca rebels northwest of Cuzco. Situated on the route between Lima and Cuzco, the region subsequently acquired vital economic and political importance, as well as an important mining region for mercury and silver. This, in turn, attracted the attention of populations from the Capital and eventually became an additionally important center of cultural diffusion.

³⁷ For example, wooden plates, vases, chairs, footwear, ropes, cushions, rugs, miniature alters.

³⁸ Stern (1982:38) offers examples of Indians engaging in commercial activities, such as building an obraje or using coca left after tribute payment to buy herd animals. Native merchants flocked to supply the dynamic mines and commercial centers of Huamanga, and artisans left *ayllus* to find opportunities elsewhere. Silverworkers joined *encomenderos* in Huamanga, where their skills yielded handsome rewards. Stonecutters earned money in colonial construction, and skilled native artisans became indispensable specialists in the Huancavelica mines” (Stern 1982:38).

economic organization.³⁹ These processes paved the way for a more Hispanicized artisan and handicraft economy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁴⁰ In the early seventeenth century, too, Spanish legal authority encouraged individualized interests and privileges within the Indian populations. Legal immunity from *mita* or tribute allowed local elites, including artisans, to avoid the burdens assigned to poorer kinsfolk, furthering deepening differentiation in Indian communities (Stern 1982:134). In Huamanga, by the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, we find a diverse range of artisan goods circulating, originating from the Huamanga workshops, exporting them principally to regional fairs and markets in Lima, where they would then be distributed along the coast.⁴¹ At the same time, as the diversity in models, materials, and representations seen in certain handmade objects from the colonial period (*retablos*, silverwork, and pottery) attests, these objects in many cases were also destined for poorer and indigenous clientele (Macera 1982).

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, marked by widespread political and economic transformations, witnessed rural craft workers relying heavier on Indian populations as clientele. The Peruvian commercial economy, narrowly and overwhelmingly focused on extraction and export of metals and commercial monopoly, led to a fragile regional economy (Bonilla and Spalding 1972, cited in Stern 1982). Rebellions in the countryside, notably the Tupac Amaru Rebellion in 1780, further attested to the onset of political fragility of the Viceroyalty. The

³⁹ See Larson, et al. 1995. for an analysis of how local populations engaged in marketization processes in the Andes in general.

⁴⁰ Virtually every form of artisanal goods underwent an extraordinary flourishing in the early 18th century in the Andes (Diéguez 1975). This period is associated with the renowned pictorial school of Cuzco and Quito, two central cities for the fast emerging pan-Andean plastic arts. In Peru, however, Ayacucho in the south and Cajamarca in the north were important not only for what were considered elite works of art but also for non-elite plastic cultural expressive forms (Pablo Macera 1974, 1979).

⁴¹ In the work of Urrutia (1983) regarding the Royal Customs Notebooks of the Huamanga Administration, between 1774 and 1824, we find considerable commercial movement of objects bearing religious imagery.⁴¹ This supply of goods for religious worship and family devotion suggests a large and wide-ranging urban clientele.

picture of colonial society in this century shows Creole elites reluctant to divert precious resources to purchasing of luxury art and craft items. So, alongside “the stagnation of the mines [in Huancavelica], the collapse of manufacturing, discouragement of trade, [we must] add the fall of craftsmanship (Gootenberg 1993:87). Additionally, with the onset of political independence in 1824, rural populations were liberated, even if only partially, from the burden of colonial taxation until the consolidation of *latifundios* in the late nineteenth century. In the late 1820s, novel, mass-produced, high-end imports began flooding Lima markets, and “[e]mphasis on fine taste [for local craftsmanship] was easily turned on its head by liberals into loud public derision of the “miserable,” “backward,” and “crude” styles of Lima crafts” (ibid.:101).^{42 43} Subsequently, artists and craftspeople who supplied elites faced a retracted commercial economy, compelling them to turn increasingly toward the indigenous peasantry.

While Ayacucho’s commercial and political importance declined in subsequent centuries,⁴⁴ the colonial period in Peru had nonetheless left an indelible mark on the means of

⁴² This pull away from local craftwork, and toward industrial products, was further reinforced by the introduction of an ideological concept of *artes mayores* (high art). Juan Acha in *Arte y Sociedad* (1979) locates in the period between the Illustration and the beginning of Emancipation (1780-1810) the transition of artisan guilds to more formal schools of art and trades, and from 1810 to mid-nineteenth century the transition to academies of art. Early forms of labor organizing has also been traced to these guilds, which preceded the establishment artisan mutual aid societies in the early 1860s, which sought protection from “free trade,” the rise of “dishonorable trades,” and incipient industrialization (see Blanchard 1982).

⁴³ While little data is known to exist on the tens of thousands of Andean-style weavers and hewers of crude household necessities in the rural provinces of Peru, we see in Lima at least that in the early nineteenth century, artisans and workshops were already articulated with a widely-connected economy, organized into corporate guilds that specialized in ornate furniture, jewelry, dresses, saddles, lace, buttons, lamps, and other luxury items. Artisan losses resulted from the Guano boom and from Peru’s importation of new foreign luxury items, which urban Europeanized elites preferred having been denied for three decades. Gootenberg finds that by the late 1840s, French, Italian, and English craftsmen ran Lima’s most prominent and prospering workshops, pushing national crafts down to occupying only one fifth of the city’s total business economy (1993:35). If urban artisans in Lima suffered from this new interest in all things foreign,⁴³ provincial artisans were dealt an even harsher blow to their economy, reflected in part by increasing artisan protests in the provinces.

⁴⁴ In the 18th century, Ayacucho emerged as a center of commercial importance within the Spanish colonies in South America, constituting a stopping point for muleteers between the viceroyalties of Peru and la Plata. While the prosperity of muleteers between Tucuman, in Argentina, and Ayacucho lasted into the beginning of the 20th century, its importance slowly decreasing with the construction of a highway following a less mountainous and thus more

production as well as the social relations of production in communities in the region. A diverse and economically differentiated crafts sector, partly dedicated to finished luxuries for Europeanized bureaucratic and merchant aristocracy, had emerged in the Ayacucho Valley. As subjugation to the absolute powers of the colonial administration meant poverty for many Indian peoples, it also shaped the emergence of an incipient middle class of artisans and craft specialists within local societies of the Huamanga region.⁴⁵ At this time, too, as Gootenberg (1993) points out, artisan political economy throughout the nation lacked any coherent development strategy and failed to devise clear collective interest/priorities. Since many artisans were still highly involved in subsistence agriculture, it is likely that they were more heavily involved in the attacks by Indian villagers on *hacendados* in their attempts to regain lands they had lost in the past.⁴⁶ These political outbursts, particularly in the 1850s and 60s, additionally compelled many elite sectors, who may have only expressed disgust initially, to express suspicion and fear of artisan unruliness.

Important outcomes of this period include: 1) a highly differentiated market: on one side, goods destined for Indian populations, and on the other, industrial goods destined for the elite; and 2) a complete distrust and thus marginalization of artisan politics, such that little, if any, state and public resources were directed to artisans. In rural regions of Ayacucho, individual craftspeople and families producing artisanal goods increasingly gravitated towards exchange in the regional and local market spheres, many muleteers carried their goods through the rural fair circuits in the highlands (Urrita 1983). The composition and use of artisan goods emerging from

easily traveled route. Ayacucho subsequently became less “cosmopolitan,” declining in commercial and political importance (Sabogal Wiesse 1979).

⁴⁵ It also permitted the coexistence, and in many cases a comingling, of indigenous and Hispanic cultural forms in certain areas of creative activities.

⁴⁶ Local uprisings as bandits and groups of *montoneros* (rural guerillas) took advantage of the political instability and lack of local authorities in late 19th century.

the early eighteenth to the late nineteenth centuries thus increasingly reflected pastoral and peasant Indian culture (Stastny 1981).⁴⁷

Craftwork in Twentieth Century Peru

At the turn of the century, the *indigenistas* fomented public and official interest in what is referred to as *arte popular* in Lima, Peru (see) (Roel Mendizábal 2000). In 1929, from the pages of the magazine *Amauta*, artist and critic of Peruvian art, Jose Sabogal, called attention to the *mates burilados* (Castrillón Vizcarra 2003), and later, in a book titled *Desván de la imagería peruana*, published in 1956, called attention to possible links between Andean festivals celebrated at the time of the book's writing and pre-Hispanic ceremonies (Sabogal 1956). The celebrated novelist and anthropologist José María Arguedas, adopting the same terminology used by *indigenistas*, celebrated what he saw as more authentically indigenous in the works and life of creators of artisanal objects. The main thrust of this movement came from what such intellectuals saw as the marginalization and unjust treatment of rural producers, particularly those identified as Indians. The observations of Arguedas upon arriving to Lima for the first time in 1919, conveys how peasants and people from highland areas were perceived in the capital city: "A person from the highland region was immediately recognized and looked upon with curiosity and disdain. They were observed as people quite strange and unfamiliar; not as citizens or compatriots" (Arguedas, et al. 1966). Both intellectuals were dedicated to fostering national pride for Peru's historical and pre-Columbian roots in customs and belief systems of Andean populations.

⁴⁷ Goods reflected Andean cosmology, ritual use for agricultural ceremonies, simple materials and techniques.

It is difficult to underestimate the importance of the *indigenista* movement not only in promoting the search for a new formulation of national identity, based on a distinctly Peruvian identity, but also in terms of sparking interest in craftwork as an expression of national identity. The involvement of middle class intellectuals in rural craftwork led to profound changes in the economic role played by craftwork. They established new physical spaces in the form of artisan fairs, popular art museums,⁴⁸ and exhibitions in the Lima capital for tourists and foreign residents in Peru to view and purchase rural craftwork. Many such foreign entities were also connected to embassies, or important foreign companies such that linkages between craftwork and wealthy national classes were immanent. Peruvian nationals, too, increasingly grew interested in artisanal goods who displayed in their homes pieces and adornments of Peruvian artesanía (Oliva and Millones 1986:96-7). From this foreign base emerged a national and international art market.

The particular framing of *lo Indio* (the Indian) by *indigenistas* had also left its mark how future, near and distant, development policy framed rural and indigenous peoples and communities. Rather than conveying the contemporary realities of Indians in Peru, such as conditions of poverty in which large numbers of such people designated as Indian lived, *indigenistas* stressed links between Peru's pre-Colombian and colonial, and thus pre-

⁴⁸ The demand for products resulted in the establishment of artisanal fairs during Fiestas Patrias and Christmas fiestas, particularly on the avenue 28th de Julio in the district of La Victoria in Lima, on the one hand, and in the Center for Art in Miraflores, established by John Davis and Isabel Benavides, which offered course in art at the same time as realizing small local demonstrations of popular art (Oliva and Millones 1986:96). Among those that helped increase their collection were the Bustamante Sisters, Pablo Macera, Jose Maria Arguedas, among others. Wood (2005:198) points out the significance of the emergence of these markets as they marked the first appearance of artesanía in a entirely public space, in a neighborhood that had already been marked by the first official incorporation of popular cultural practices. The link between Fiestas Patrias and Christmas further reflects the acceptance of artesanía as part of the historical-cultural program of the nation.

capitalist, past and the Indian (Lauer 1982).⁴⁹ *Lo Indio*, rather than a plurality, was referenced in the singular in *indigenista* discourse. Indian populations were rarely seen as individual people working in the historical constraints of encroaching capitalist markets. *Indgenistas*, like Alicia Bustamente, who sought to bring artisan goods from their rural place of production to urban markets and collections, approached artisan products not as a discovery or revelation but one of mystification. Artisan producers, depicted as anonymous and idealized or romanticized Indian, filled the gaps of a deliberately forgotten history. Rather than showing the material conditions of artisans, pressed by declining opportunities for livelihood, depicted a romanticized Inca, perpetuating the imagery of the noble savage. Out of this discourse emerged a new ideology based on the marginalization of particular forms of production as “pre-capitalist.” Artesanía in particular seemed to belong to a different economic system from that of the rest of the country. This neglect also obscured problems of class shaping oppression of indigenous and rural populations. This tendentious disconnection from contemporary realities in the 1920s set future specialists and development planners to emphasize the so-called pre-capitalist nature of artisanal objects and the conditions of production in which they were made (Lauer 1976, 1982, 1989).

State promotion of artesanía did not take shape until somewhat later, in the 1940s and ‘50s⁵⁰ (Rowe and Schelling 1991). State officials found impetus for recontextualization of

⁴⁹ For example, the objective of the Instituto de Arte Popular, the result of years of promoting indigenous populations by Jose Sabogal and Luis E Valcarcel: “To study the art of the cultures of Ancient Peru” and “to contribute all efforts for the conservation of popular arts” (Wood 2005).

⁵⁰ Official recognition by the State did not emerge until the early 1930s, when government officials supported the installation of the permanent exhibition known as Arte Indigenista, Escolar y Popular (Wood 2005:page). It was in this material space that formally and explicitly expressed the relationships between indigenismo and popular artistic expressions. With the democratic experience of 1945 and Valcarcel at the head of the Ministry of Education, offered a special opportunity. In this same year, the Section for Folklore and Popular Arts was created in the Ministry, which charged a group of teachers the task of gathering information on the local traditions of their zones of work. Through these means, to quote Roel Mendizábal (2000), “folklore, as much as it was a reservoir for authentic

folklore, including artesanía, in *indigenista* discourse (e.g., the possibility of national rebirth of oppressed Andean cultures). Yet, rather than assuming the *indigenista* perspective, which stressed conservation, the State took on a more obscure stance on the issue of preservation. Artistic expressions from popular cultures were seen in terms of their foreign and commercial value (Wood 2005:188), but such expressions needed to attend to tastes of foreign consumers if they were to make any headway into the national economy. In this move toward commercial orientation, we see the emergence of the State political tendencies to assimilate artisanal practices to the agenda in particular ways. Such tendencies, although manifested differently in policy discourse and projects, would continue into the present day.

Recent History of Craftwork in Quinua

This contracted history of the political economy of craftwork in the Huamanga (Ayacucho) Valley brings us up to the point when, according to oral tradition circulating today, pottery making began in Quinua.⁵¹ At the turn of the century, in rural Peru the Indian population largely relied on subsistence agriculture, while also participating to some extent in the regional commercial economy. The ceramic goods made by people in Quinua were primarily contracted contracted pieces by individuals for ceremonial purposes or made by the dozen for domestic use. In Quinua, too, families relied primarily on agricultural production and the sale of livestock

expressions, emerged as a vehicle for the search of national identity reliant on the provincial base, for which it had to be appropriated, manipulated, and re-semanticized in spaces very different from the original [spaces in which they emerged]” (79).

⁵¹ Little information, if any, exists that undoubtedly and directly links contemporary pottery production in Quinua to a pre-Hispanic past. Archaeologists have found evidence of molding techniques in the area below Quinua occupied by the Wari culture, known for high-quality ceramics (Cook and Benco 2012; Loza 2008; Pozzi-Escot *et al.* 1993; Valdez 2012). Written records also show evidence that potters were plying their trade as early as the sixteenth century in the Ayacucho region, although it is not known if these potters were from Quinua or another community in the valley (Arnold 1993:197-99). Valdez (1997), however, cautions against making any direct links (i.e., direct transfers of knowledge and skills between generations) between Wari pottery production and present-day production in Quinua.

while ceramic objects were made for barter exchange in the rainy seasons when agricultural production subsided during the annual cycle. These items were not produced in large quantities and through more systematic production practices as we see in Quinua today. In oral narratives of the Quinua region today, pottery making and exchange (*trueque*, ritual ceremonial, and commercial exchange), did, however, constitute part of muleteer networks crossing the Ayacucho region. A couple Quinua artisans older than sixty described (and in one case, even owned one) hand-powered turn tables made from volcanic tuff contrasting them to later manifestations of the technology made from wood and more common purchased metallic forms. The productivity gains through efficient division of labor was likewise found in older periods of pottery production in the region. Furthermore, beyond their circulation in cash markets, they have been gifted, traded, extracted through taxes and tribute for several millennia (Larson, *et al.* 1995). This temporal aspect of artisan production highlights a long trajectory of artisan products as central at every level of local, regional, national and global economies.

Older artisans in present day Quinua described their fathers and grandfathers as exchanging clay objects for foodstuffs for foodstuffs and items not produced by the family. Certain ceramic objects, like large churches, *musicos*, pitchers, plates, and drinking vessels in particular, were contracted for *safacasas* and other familial and community celebrations. The preparation of *chicha* (corn beer), which is consumed by people in the Andes especially for religious celebrations and agricultural activities, also requires a variety of large vessels (Arnold 1993). Families organizing these festivals often contracted potters to make larger quantities of plates in order to serve food for their guests. Pottery was also required for storing diverse varieties of crops produced in the region as well as for cooking vessels. *Urpas* (large pot-like vessels), for instance, are considered an ideal type of pottery for storing products like beans,

wheat, barley, quinoa, maize, and dehydrated tubers, like *chuno*. Other types of pottery used for storage included *maqmas* and *tinajas*.

Artisans and other inhabitants of the district today recall from stories their grandparents told them that Faustino Nolasco, along with Dionisio Lope, both from Inkacasa, were followers of the first potter called Otccochocho,⁵² who made utilitarian pieces – mostly pots with four, six, ten, and sometimes twelve handles. Pots bearing more handles were larger in size, usually contracted on a case-by-case basis for ceremonies and fiestas.

While today the miniature churches placed on rooftops of new homes are emblematic of traditional Quinoa pottery, most potters today agree that these were not the oldest, or even the most important, forms. The oldest examples of Quinoa pottery, dating to late-nineteenth/early-twentieth century, are earthenware vessels by a few potter families, who used the coiling method to make utilitarian and ceremonial pots, pitchers, and figures. These pieces were fired in an adobe-brick kiln and then burnished to a high gloss using smooth stones, a tradition that only a handful of Quinoa potters have continued into the twenty-first century. Local histories tell us that these earliest-known potters in the Quinoa area resided in the outlying communities of the lower Lurinsayocc zone and Moya where the terrain is deeply eroded with gullies and canyons next to streams. Producers today still find the beds of volcanic tuff and exposed clay easily mined for potting clay and temper. As one artisan in his forties recalls:

Pots were made in Inkacasa, below Quinoa, in the community of Moya. There was an artisan named Faustino Nolasco, from the family Nolasco, who was a very loved and esteemed artisan. He had a market in Huamanguilla... and he supplied virtually all the communities. This family called Nolasco assisted their nephew who lived close to my house... who made beautiful earthenware jugs with delicate, slender necks... all with natural clay, clay from the zone. In this my grandfather, the stepfather of my father, learned, and I learned with closely alongside him. My grandfather lived so close to me and I would escape from my chores and go watch him while he turned on his wheel, and I

⁵² Present-day potters refer to the wider area surrounding Inkacasa as Otccochocho.

so much enjoyed watching him as he shaped and made plates. It was incredible. So when my mother saw me go to my grandfather's, she let me because she saw that I enjoyed it. When he went to sell just the same I followed him. He would leave to sell ceramics carrying them with two mules. I, too, carried some little things I made to Huamanguilla... So we went to Huamanguilla to sell, and this was a routine of my grandfather every Sunday.

In a narrative more widely circulated in scholarly accounts and public channels, the ceramic craft originated from the work of Francisco Sanchez, known as “el Aire” because his ceramics were so fine as to appear to have been blown by air. His son Santos Sanchez also became a talented ceramicist, whose pieces are now featured in museums and private collections in Lima. F. Sanchez's grandson, Mamerto Sanchez, followed in his father's craft, continues innovating on older forms and creating new designs in the present-day. The Sanchez potters, now spanning four generations, is one of the most famous families within the Quinua craft tradition.⁵³

The early twentieth century witnessed several crucial transformations in the local and regional economy in which the population of Quinua was intertwined. First, notions of cultural and national identity became explicitly linked with goods produced in rural areas and mostly by hand-powered means. Due in part to the Pro-Indian (*Indigenista*) movement of the 1920s and 30s, objects created in the rural Andean countryside gained a foothold in official and public consciousness.⁵⁴ Elite and middle class intellectuals offered representations of

⁵³ I refrain from saying that the Sanchez family has been the most influential family in the Quinua pottery tradition. While also a matter of perspective and open to much debate, this fact is due to several factors (involving, for example, what Max Weber called “charismatic authority”), many of which will become apparent throughout the remainder of this dissertation. I do believe that the Sanchez family narrative is arguably the most prominent – in terms of the degree to which their work and history are featured in newspapers, popular art periodicals, private collections, museums, and whole host of other media – of all potter families originating out of Quinua.

⁵⁴ Briefly summarizing the objectives of the indigenismo movement, Wood (2005) highlights the celebration by participants in the movement of *lo indio* in response to the latter population's subjectification. *Lo indio* of the present represented the country's past, where specifically the study of artifacts with so-called artistic qualities served as a form of acceptance of indigenous cultures. Such objects further demonstrated that the cultures of the creators were advanced, since they expressed high levels of organization as well as cultural, religious and aesthetic expression.

such objects as “folk art” (*arte popular*), basing them on notions of cultural purity of pre-Columbian Andean societies, as they sought to efface all linkages to colonial forms.⁵⁵

Second, a new kind of relationship emerged between client and producer, one that was established more so on cash and consumer tastes. The Ayacucho region in particular came to national and public attention in 1941, when Alicia Bustamante (and others, like her sister Celia and her brother-in-law Jose Maria Arguedas who were associated with Peru’s indigenista movement) encouraged the now famous Ayacuchano artist Joaquín López Antay to expand the themes in his work to include representations of people’s everyday life.⁵⁶ In the late 1940s, a family of merchants in Ayacucho perceived the additional commercial value of ceramic items, not only for themselves but also for the artisans themselves, and began to contract ceramic goods from Quinua artisans (Sabogal Wiese 1979:22-23; Mitchell 1997:36). The nationally renowned Quinua artisan, Mamerto Sanchez, recalled observing, after having heard of the churches his father made, visited his home and requested a large order of small churches to sell in the then newly burgeoning popular art and tourist markets in Lima.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ This marks a shift in Peru from the republican period (1895-1930), a time when society in general expressed disinterest towards all things cultural. This disinterest was particularly expressed towards those expressions that sprouted forth from the autochthonous contemporary reality and for monumental and artistic linkages with pre-Columbian and colonial Peru (Basadre 1929:12). In its eagerness to develop a modern State and compete with the development of other countries, ruling elites of the republic preferred to look to exogenous, rather than endogenous, forms of artistic and scientific techniques as well as models for building an economy, thereby privileging imitation of extra-national forms of creativity (Oliva and Millones 1986).

⁵⁶ Prior to Bustamante’s involvement the iconographic domain of retablos belonged to ceremonial events linked to agricultural celebrations, such as harvests. Alicia Bustamante and Lopez Antay met in the latter’s workshop located in the city of Ayacucho, the capital of the Department of the same in name, to which Quinua pertains. This trip and subsequent ones grew public interest for *artesanía Ayacucho*, known most of all for the retablo. (See Ulfe 2009)

⁵⁷ It was not until 1954, as the artisan recalls, that a merchant, Tomas Gutierrez, initiated commercial trade in ceramics on a larger scale, selling the goods to Carlos Vivanco in Ayacucho, who would in turn sell them to buyers during the Fiesta de 28 de Julio or transport them to sell in Lima (Wiese 1979:22). John Davis, a North American, also began contracting ceramic pieces in the 1950s, with a different thinking about artisans and their products. Rather than looking on artisan goods solely in terms of the symbolic work they do for indigenous population, which he argued tended to prioritize the object over the producer, John Davis worked with the idea of providing good

Until the 1950s, several families were still producing utilitarian pottery for barter exchange with communities in the surrounding area to supplement agriculture and temporary wage-work, for instance, on state infrastructure projects (Arnold 1993). Particularly with the migration of people from rural areas surrounding Ayacucho, ceramics goods from Quinua began to appear in Lima in the year 1950. Many migrants built their livelihoods almost entirely on selling artisanal products. In rural Quinua, families likewise increasingly dedicated their time outside of agricultural work to making crafts. Adult men and women could not find work in their communities or in the urban areas, which were quickly becoming overpopulated, opted for artisanal activity for cash-earning purposes. This shift in livelihood activities in Quinua, and the Peruvian countryside in general, further points to the growing agrarian question in Peru, where the Latifundia movement had left many campesinos without land and sources of livelihood. Thus began the first spike in the numbers of rural populations producing artesanía, which also saw a new generation of artisan producers who were beginning to export their pieces (Soriano Giraldo 2011). The oldest potter, in his early eighties, living in Quinua today recalled that sometime during the early 1950s airplanes began to arrive in Ayacucho where he and others carted their ceramic goods to sell for direct exportation. These local accounts align with the data found in such scholarly works, which is evidence of a boom in interest in all things “cultural” (i.e., indigenous and Indian) in the 1940s and 1950s.⁵⁸

prices for artisans, emphasizing the maker of goods and his need to provide for his family (John A. Davis, personal interview 2011).

⁵⁸ In the department of Ayacucho, we also see in the 1950s the beginnings of competitions for popular art organized by the municipality of Ayacucho, one of the first winners of which was, notably, Joaquin Lopez Antay. Lopez Antay thus grew to be an important symbol for the promotion of artesanía and arte popular. For indigenistas, he symbolized the double participation by many rural and indigenous peoples’ in native and western cultures. In his seminal essay, “Notas elementales sobre al arte popular religioso y las culturas mestizo de Huamanga” (1958), the renowned indigenista Jose Maria Arguedas describes Lopez Antay as a cultural creator who partakes in “double participation, of native and western cultures, [which] is manifests in certain mestizos ... in a harmonic and well

In 1958, as part of new policies for industrialization,⁵⁹ the State hired Mamerto Sanchez,⁶⁰ Mamerto's brother-in-law, and an ex-municipal official, to instruct pottery making at the first state-run educational center established in Quinua. Families sent brothers, sons, fathers, and husbands to enroll in instructional courses at the Quinua artisan center, where they learned to mold by hand from Mamerto, one of the most recognized artisans even at that time, along with his brother-in-law, whose family also is said to have been skilled in the craft. Women more often than men were forthcoming about this invasive proliferation of craftworkers during this period.

A clearly commercial imperative emerged from institutional development discourse, including a desire to include as many people as possible under the rubric of "artesanía," which included: dressmaking, tailoring, shoemaking, carpentry, blacksmith, tinsmith, masonry, and stonework (Wood 2005:186). It was this commercial imperative encouraged by State policy and programs that would take hold of the public eye in approaching *artesanía* in the following decade. While artisan production and sale would continue to receive the benefits of a booming

integrated manner" (157). Lopez Antay thus exemplified the mestizo, the retablo a product of a deep and very assimilated cultural and religious mestizaje.

⁵⁹ For the State officials, artesanía played a distinctly economic role for the Peruvian nation. The creation of the Section for Artistic Crafts in the National School for the Fine Arts in Lima and in the Ayacucho area forms of this intervention as well as are the government-supported distribution of models for decoration among weavers of Ayacucho (Mendizábal Losack 1958). The justifications for the project manifested through the Section for Artistic Crafts reflects the explicit intentions of State goals to reformulate artesanía s to fit its agenda (for a detailed list see Mendizábal Losack 1958:40). Following the example of Mexico, State officials held the opinion that factors in artesanía offered a way of commercialization that involved minimal, if at all, investment in industrial production. Strong relationships between the zone of production, it was further thought, and urban areas offered possible solutions to massive migration to coastal cities. It further promised to create the nexus between marginalized campesinos and the national projects. Since then, this sort of consultancy approach has been practiced by various national entities, above all the Escuelas de Formacion Artesanal.

⁶⁰ Mamerto Sanchez Cardenas operated his pottery at several sites, including the area known as Otccochuco far from the town center, followed by the Quinua town center, and presently in both the center and the Vitarte neighborhood of Lima. Having to walk door to door to recruit new students, Mamerto first taught lessons in his home and later in the building established in the town center. Among the dozens of young boys who worked with Mamerto, many of them continue in the craft in their adulthood today, acknowledging Mamerto's instructive during their formative years. The sculptor Aristides Quispe Lope, one of the best and most prolific ceramicists among the generation following Mamerto's, now makes large sculptures out of clay that he mines from Quinua, for which he has also received the title of Amauta, the highest title conferred on artisans by the Peruvian state.

market in the 1960s, artisans themselves continued to go without the technical and market assistance that many have claimed is increasingly important in any sustainable development approach. A new wave of foreign assistance⁶¹ also played into the economic situation and interests of people from rural areas, including Quinua, who were not directly working with assistance programs but who were nonetheless faced with decreasing land and few options for employment.

In this environment, people through their own initiative flooded the market, encouraged by the fact that much artisanal work requires little to no startup costs, but did so without any type of technical orientation or business plan (Soriano Giraldo 2011). Artisans too have been perceptive of such external processes and agents that place pressure on and thus act, in part, as shaping forces of change for their material practices of production and earning a living. In Lima, the introduction of new technology, particularly plaster molds for ceramic production, is an excellent example in this regard. Migrants from Quinua adopted this technology in order to speed up production and thus respond to the increasing demand for cheap, mass-produced artisan goods.

⁶¹ The commercial impulse for artisan goods in the 1960s received a strong stimulus from the Alliance for Progress program, which was founded on the recognition that artisan products were aptly suited for commercial exportation to the United States (Soriano Giraldo 2011; Wood 2005). This particular political and development intervention, alongside encouragement of mass production, introduced plaster-mold techniques. As part of this bilateral agreement between the United States and Peru, in 1962, the North American Peace Corp program was introduced, significantly working in areas demonstrating large ethnic populations (e.g. Mexico and Guatemala, and of course, Peru), a program which lasted seven to eight years in Peru. The impact of the advisory engagements should be understood in relation to other social changes: often the aesthetic advisor was doing no more than inform producers of processes already in march in the market, or on occasions he or she also tried to put a stop to a process that was beginning to escape the “artisanal” and Indian artisanship quality (Lauer 1982:70). The sixty PC members working in Peru also introduced new designs suited to the tastes of tourist and export art markets, incentivizing artisans to participate by distributing food in the workshops organized. Soriano Giraldo (2011) presents this relationship between artisan producer and foreign development workers as beneficial to producers who lacked ideas for designs and lacked markets. Ultimately, the PC aggressively pursued a project for commercialization, which attempted and, depending on who you ask, even achieved to improve designs and possibilities of sale for products. It also led to the creation of commercial firms specifically emerging out of the technical assistance and skills-training workshops implemented by PC. A more sobering account would highlight the relationship of dependency, as indicative of the culture of development planning and practice in this decade that took root in these workshops.

Craftwork as a local practice this really took hold in rural and indigenous communities throughout the country. Between 1966 and 1991, the number of ceramicists in Quinua jumped from less than fifty to over five hundred, and at least one member of most families produces ceramics for commercial markets (Mitchell 1991:9). Highland pottery production, like much craft specialization in the Andes and Latin America generally, has increasingly become a primary source of income for many rural households in response to economic and ecological pressures combined with new channels for marketing crafts (Colloredo-Mansfeld 1999; Meisch 2002, 2009; Nash 1993; Zorn 2004). In Quinua, pottery manufacture was the principal cash-earning industry of the village and, indeed, of the entire district in its fledgling years (Tschopik 1947:33). Producers began to sell to other buyers, even transporting the goods themselves to sell in Lima. Increasing interest in ceramic and other artisan goods attracted the attention of other residents of Quinua, who observed significant cash incomes of the few ceramicists up to this point in time as these producers were able to purchase new household goods and rely less on agricultural subsistence, which was increasingly a less sufficient livelihood option. One townsman even set up a ceramic shop in Vitarte, an old working-class and industrial suburb of Lima, to sell the work of Quinua artisans (Huaman Oriundo 1999; Mitchell 1997:36).

However fruitful these projects and institutions were designed to be, the weakest and perhaps most deadly in the long run, involved the fact that artesanía was not envisioned as business on a large scale, it did not receive adequate division of labor, and insufficient numbers of buyers and exporters existed to take on the growing numbers of people engaging in artisanal production. Both the influx of people working in artisanal production as well as the government-backed artisan preparatory schools, which transmitted basic production skills and even the use of simple tools (e.g., plaster molds to make serial copies in ceramic production), articulated with a

growing segmentation in the plastic expressive cultures of rural and indigenous people. On the one hand, the 1960s witnessed the first apparent generation of individuals who were recognized as working in an artistic vein of *artesanía*, often referred to as *arte popular*. This form of *artesanía* gained its own space in the public and intellectual realms, as ceramicists from Quinua and Chulucanas and weavers from Ayacucho began to produce and sell for a more up-scale foreign market. On the other hand, products of lesser quality were sold through channels internal to the country, which attracted people with low-technical skills and worked for low wages. Spiraling intermediation also furthered the unequal access to markets and distribution of wealth. In Quinua, ceramic production became increasingly organized around the market and a new range of private and public institutions grew up with it.

Present-day Political Economy and Craftwork in the District of Quinua

Along with these changes in livelihood opportunities, particularly related to decreasing land bases, the local power structure in Quinua also underwent significant change. In the 1950s, the authority figures of the District of Quinua were individuals from economically powerful families, including merchants of artisan and other goods as well as small-scale commercial agriculturalists. (Interestingly, many of these families' sons would, in later years, become prominent artisans.) Underway by 1966, the migration of these families to Lima—many of whom left to sell artisan goods in the Lima capital—hastened a process of internal social and economic disintegration in Quinua (Huaman Oriundo 1999). Because these families had held somewhat of a political monopoly on the administration of district governmental affairs, their departure allowed for new figures to take political control.

The degree of subsistence farming balanced with market production was partly dependent

on longstanding livelihood practices, but it was also influenced by state agricultural and industrial policy. In the 1970s, for example, the government of Alvarado Velasco attempted the reform of community organization in Peru, beginning with the change in official title of *comunidad indigena* to *comunidad campesina*.⁶² Prior to 1970, the annexes were neither present nor represented in the local power nexus of the district as a whole. With the new State reforms in place by 1970, annexes began to participate in a direct manner in district assemblies held in the town center, primarily on Sundays, at the same time that their members were permitted elected leaders within the district political sphere.⁶³ At the same time, the *comunidades campesinas* became targets for development funds, which attracted a high degree of attention among residents for being members of the *comunidades*, especially when a project was in operation (Vincent 2004). This push to include the voice of the rural population of the district marked a significant shift in local politics (Del Pino YEAR). Not only were more people petitioning for the support of their respective community centers, there were a larger percentage of the rural population, that is, *campesinos*. Thus, while the reforms aimed to revitalize traditional norms and values of land utilization (i.e., prohibition of the sub-division and fragmentation of resources), they nonetheless led to a reorganization of community relationships among the Quinoa population.

Nonetheless, the majority of public works in the district were still executed in the town

⁶² The distinction here is important because, as Dobyns (1970, cited in Long 1975:76) points out, it involved substituting a concept implying racial criteria to one of socio-economic criteria. At the same time, the Agrarian Reform Law of 1970 allocated a critical role to the newly designated *comunidades campesinas* under the new agrarian structure. Intended to defend old prerogatives of rural communities but also modernize them, the Agrarian Reform Law laid out a new relationship between the government and rural populations. The law pushed for introducing modern cooperative forms of organization. See Long 1975 for a more detailed description of the Agrarian Reform Law.

⁶³ See Huaman Oriundo 1999 for a detailed discussion of particular individuals originating from annexed communities assuming political posts in the district. Interesting, almost all representatives of annexes had once migrated to the coast to find work, returning home to their community annex with new ideas for improving the livelihoods of their fellow community members.

center where the greatest *concentrated* number of the population of Quinua resided. In the early 1970s, for instance, the *municipio* achieved the remodeling of the principal plaza, connection of the water system between residences, and concrete lining of the irrigation canals in the parts of the Lorensayocc barrio located in the immediate environs of the town center. Yet, in the annexes the municipal authorities of the district did not construct any such projects in this period, while their own communal authorities, with the help of the community, achieved small projects, such as a school in one communal center and passable roadways connecting the centers of Llamahuilca and Moya to the newly paved highway (Huaman Oriundo 1999). The primary schools constructed in different annexes were achieved through the communal labor of the people and, in some cases, were supported by a public institution (e.g., Cooperacion Popular, CORFA).⁶⁴

Economic and Political downturn: Widespread Transformations

At the end of the 1980s, the increase of political violence and the economic crisis led to hardship for rural populations.⁶⁵ The region of Ayacucho was overwhelmingly submerged in that uprising of Sendero Luminoso and other rebel factions looking to overturn the Peruvian State. In the early years of the political violence, while the district of Quinua did not organize a *ronda campesina* as the neighboring districts of Huamangilla, Tambo, and Acos Vinchos had.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ See Huaman Oriundo 1999:46-49 for an extended description of these projects.

⁶⁵ Studies have linked economic reform with the dramatic violence in Peru in the 1980s to early 90s by Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path) and later government suppression (McCormick 1990; Seligmann 1995, 1998; Shifter 2004; Solfrini 2001; Stern 1998). Local membership associations, particularly indigenous organizations, were greatly weakened by the guerillas or by army suppression (Bebbington and Carroll 2000; Degregori 1998; McClintock 1989). Indeed, during these years, rural and indigenous communities in Peru suffered along many dimensions, including devastating poverty levels (Psarcharopoulos and Patrinos 1994).

⁶⁶ With enough base support gathered by the end of 1982, Sendero had started mounting attacks against mayors, teachers, and civic leaders, most “people of modest means” who were identified as linked to a corrupt state. The intervention of the Armed Forces in 1983, which dealt strong blows to the guerillas, further compelled Sendero to

The district was thus a kind of refuge for the Shining Path guerillas.⁶⁷ In 1990, however, bases from neighboring *rondas* began pressuring the people of Quinua to join, and although local authorities and the population in general rejected these pressures⁶⁸, the increasing abusive force of neighboring *rondas* forced Quinuenos to organize a *ronda* in 1991. Pressures to organize also came from local people themselves after witnessed, and in many cases, became victim to a massacre in Quinua in 1984 at the hands of the armed forces. Felix Sanchez, a potter and former resident of Quinua, described the event:

I, before coming to Lima, lived in a small farmhouse in Huallhuayoc, in the annex of Moya (in the district of Quinua). My father worked there long ago with his ceramics. I worked with my father since I was a small child. The reason I came to Lima was the terrorism. When the *rondas campesinas* organized [in the areas surrounding Quinua] they didn't let us work in Quinua. For this reason, I came to Lima. The military and the *rondas campesinas* of Huamanguilla and Castropampa organized us. They rounded up everyone, more or less 150 people or more, young people, adults, children, everyone, from six in the morning until mid-day. They dragged us by force from our homes. Using vulgar words, sometimes one of us reacted, and we talked until it got out of hand. When I hit one of them, he went to the military to complain, saying that we had treated him with disrespect, and they stripped all of us naked. We were punished almost four hours in the patio of the school. That was when the *ronderos* of Huamanguilla joined the armed forces. We were forced to organize ourselves, and once we were organized, we started patrolling. During these years, I was the number one patrol group with the army, and we no longer worked or returned to our houses. Rarely did we ever go home. This was in 1988 and '89. In 1991, I was already in Lima. They looked for me because I didn't attend political meetings of the [*ronderos*].

intensify violence and so began to torture and kill civilians thought to be army sympathizers. Abimael Guzmán himself authorized these massacres, such as that of more than eighty peasants in the village of Lucanamarca (Víctor Fajardo province) in April 1983. During 1983 and 1984, terror had swallowed entire areas, like that of the Apurímac Valley, where more than a thousand died in 1983 alone. Between 1983 and 1985, the declared emergency zone grew from nine to twenty-seven provinces, and more than five thousand people (over 1 percent of the population) fell victim to the violence in this zone. (Starn, ed. 2005) The most brutal experience occurred in the *punas* of Huanta, where sixty-eight communities disappeared as an effect of repression by Sendero, and in La Mar, where seventy-five more were obliterated. (del Pino H. 1998:163)

⁶⁷ The upper zones of Quinua, like Saraccha and Nawimpuquio, however, suffered greatly from the political violence, especially in 1987. The suppression by military forces, which included burning down houses, forced most community members to abandon their homes, migrating to the central town of Quinua or even migrating to the coast (Huaman Oriundo 1999:52).

⁶⁸ Armando Villanueva, a local elite, returned from Lima where he had migrated, presenting documents of abuse suffered by Quinuenos inflicted by neighboring *rondas*. The village also claimed that Quinua should be exempt from organizing a *ronda* on the pretext that the village was a historical zone (Huaman Oriundo 1999:52).

The degree of violence of this particular incident was the first among many to follow. It thus gave impetus to the first wave of families fleeing to Ayacucho or Lima. Although the *ronda* in Quinua enacted less violence, resulting in a smaller number of deaths, compared to neighboring districts, the power of traditional authorities in Quinua diminished. This was due to, first, as Felix's testimony suggests, their inability to completely resist integration into the *ronda* movement and, second, the 1989 declaration of the Ayacucho region (in which Quinua is included) as a zone of emergency suspended constitutional guarantees.

Several important changes resulted from this upheaval of traditional authority structures. The leaders of the *ronda*, under military rule, assumed virtually absolute power in the district, eventually assuming roles once held by traditional authorities. Women and young adults also were encouraged to assume charges within the *ronda*, where once they had been excluded from all political positions of district and annex community affairs. Also, having gained the support of the *ronderos*, the mayor elected in 1990, Susano Mendoza (who would hold office for four more consecutive terms) assumed powers that were not under his political jurisdiction. In a parallel process, political authorities of annex communities were forced to abandon their roles, and virtually all attempts to implement public projects halted.

The war had deleterious impacts at multiple societal levels (Poole and Rénique 1992). Even after the violence had declined, women and young adults continued to participate to some degree in local politics. Traditional political figures of the district, however, did not want to give up their positions, which meant resentment, and sometimes outright conflict, between new and older residents of Quinua.

The war, however, was only one manifestation of "the revolutionary transformation of Peruvian society, symptoms of underlying stress" (Mitchell 1999:236). The economic crisis

simultaneously occurring at the end of the 1980s led to any development project resources being cut off.⁶⁹ No longer did ceramicists, for instance, receive state funding to travel and attend artisan fairs in the Lima capital. Lower tariffs brought the flood of foreign products onto the domestic market. Increased competition led to losses for local industry, including artisanal production, giving rise to the level of demand for credit. Further, with the 1990s and the neoliberal government of Alberto Fujimori, collective endeavors were not viewed positively, which materialized as legislation that would allow for communal land to be privatized and *comunidades campesinas* to be dissolved. Since the 1980s, successive Peruvian administrations have thus drastically cut education and health services, dismantled cooperatives created under the 1969 agrarian reform, decimated agricultural subsidies, and fostered inequality by liberalizing land markets (Manrique 1996; Yashar 2005). Even though agricultural output grew in the 1990s, more than 50 percent of the population lived below the poverty line (Gonzales de Olarte 1998). These policies, though they had little impact on promoting agricultural production to the benefit of small-scale rural farmers (Robles Mendoza 2002), set in a motion a pattern of avoidance of the *comunidad campesina* political structure into the 2000s (Vincent 2012). As part of this new neoliberal agenda, government began “courting or creating other civil society groups” through community-based projects (Vincent 2012:58). Business associations became a central part of this approach to encourage civic engagement.

⁶⁹ The neoliberal program that began to be adopted and implemented in Peru in mid-1980 began with the Belaunde administrations call for the reduction of state enterprise and the stimulation of private investment. Elimination of government intervention in pricing, marketing, and the financial system; reduction of in tariffs and trade barriers, as well as currency devaluations intended to maximize Peru’s competitiveness in foreign export markets, all signaled the government’s priority to open the economy domestically and internationally (Pastor and Wise 1992).

Concluding Remarks

In the last decade in Peru, studies of the private sector have increasingly argued for the importance of the presence of small businesses and microenterprises. Economist and Ex-Minister of the Ministry of work in Peru called attention to the government's neglect of the potential of small enterprises, particularly of the informal kind (Villarán 1998). Small businesses are born on their own, he stated, in an environment in which no one helps them. They nurture themselves from resources they have immediately available to them, rather than through the privileges and favors conferred to formal enterprises by the State. In a later publication, he argued even that Peru did not have *enough* of small-scale production firms (Villarán 2000). Thus, while Peru exhibits great potential to generate competitiveness and wellbeing through the creation of new firms, however, policy-makers and development planners have generally been unable to consolidate entrepreneurial dynamics.

In line with much of the World Bank's and IMF proposals for structural adjustment, Hernando de Soto⁷⁰ further advocated opening up the economy to foreign investment and competition, abolishing exchange controls, export-led growth deregulating and thus opening up the economy to market forces. Selling off governmental assets and public corporations, and dramatically cutting public sector salaries and personnel, De Soto argued, would complement a program to give formal property title to people living as squatters. The program, funded by the World Bank, ultimately rested on de Soto's observations of the population's display of "initiative and entrepreneurial dynamism by finding 'informal' means of production and reproduction-

⁷⁰ Founder of the Instituto de Libertad y Democracia in 1980, de Soto has worked intermittently with the governments of Alan Garcia [1985-90] and Alberto Fujimori [1990-]. The title of his most influential book *The Other Path* (2002) is a conscious reference to his prescriptions for a non-violent alternative to *Sendero Luminoso's* violent approach of national purification through blood and fire. See Timothy Mitchell (2008) for a critique of De Soto. See Jose Matos Mar (1986) for a complementary argument for the growth of grassroots movements.

establishing enterprises, providing services, and obtaining access to land, housing, utilities, and essential commodities through personal, household, and community initiatives that fall outside the government's 'planned,' 'regulated,' and 'managed' economy" (Bromley 1990:330-31). Paradoxically, despite seeing individuals as embedded in social relations, these narratives ultimately seek to free "latent individuals who are held captive within the limiting confines of traditional society" in order that they redirect and invest social energy, previously channeled into "traditional" community life, into modern systems of citizenship and market economy (García Canclini 1993:139).

These programs additionally saw "unique" cultural heritages belonging to rural and indigenous populations as necessary ingredients and accordant with capitalist markets and self-help agency. While this 'cultural turn' in policy reflects critical attention to political struggles for culturally appropriate, or 'ethno-', development (Davis 2002; Davis and Partridge 1994; Healy 2001; Kleymeyer 1994), it shapes *developmentally appropriate culture* (Andolina *et al.* 2009). Ultimately, new narratives are emerging about the cultural work done by artisans for national development, which when told by certain institutions, like state agencies, compel people to increasingly value efficiency and seek profits and market shares and earn individual incomes. Indeed, the "ethnic entrepreneur" is encouraged to transform culture for market citizenship, by learning to commercialize identity as handicrafts, cultural performances, and eco-tourism (Colloredo-Mansfeld 2011; Comaroff and Comaroff 2009; DeHart 2010). State-backed institutions, like CARE Peru and FONCODES, have since implemented joint-projects organizing artisan enterprises into associations in Quinua and other communities throughout the Ayacucho region (Indacochea 2001). Indeed, with promises of new markets, artisans in Quinua enthusiastically took part in new projects of collective efficiency and local development.

CHAPTER 3

BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS

The Moral and Political Dynamics

“Associations don’t work in Quinua,” Faustino Huasacca summarily stated before switching to talk of his latest venture for a business association. His words echoed those of Roberto Gutierrez (see the opening of Chapter one) who had also mentioned Faustino as one of the coordinators for the association in which Roberto had once participated.

Working at a *toqtoq*,⁷¹ his hands caked in clay, Faustino was explaining Qenwa Ayllukuna – the name of the business association he had recently formed for the purposes of presenting a project to the UNDP’s program “Inclusive Creative Industries: an innovative tool for alleviating poverty in Peru.”⁷²

Qenwa Ayllukuna. Qenwa Ayllukuna is the name of my group. Long ago the mamitas from the chakra called Quinua Qenwa. ‘Qenwaman richkani. I’m going to Qenwa,’ they’d say. The name of the district comes from a plant that grows here. In Quechua, ‘Qenwa,’ they say... Ayllukuna? It means family from Quinua. Or it could mean of blood or of customs. They’re families, no? For example, traditional ceramics, local dishes... or rather, they’re things of the village, no? All that’s original to here [from Quinua]. Traditional customs. They’re families, they’re related too... it includes all the customs, experiences. That’s what the name of our association means.

“You already have an association. The APA,⁷³ right?” I asked, “Why don’t you work with them?”

⁷¹ A traditional, rounded vessel for toasting *cancha*. Families most often made these items for barter exchange. They would transport them to markets and Sunday fairs by mule and exchange them for food stuffs, especially corn and other grains. The vessel would be filled with the grain item and the producer would receive this amount in exchange for the vessel.

⁷² Industrias Creativas Inclusivas

⁷³ Pseudonym for an association.

A prominent artisan and politician in the district, Faustino seemed especially open to conversations about local politics, rumors, and disagreements but also local customs, sharing information about ceramic making, and visions for future projects that would benefit artisans in the district. In his late thirties, Faustino had a long, and still growing, resume (the only artisan I knew who actually had a resume) that reinforced my impression of him when I first met him back in 2009 during a brief trip to Quinua. At the time, Faustino worked as a professor at the local artisan school, teaching ceramic practices, and some theory, to high school students. Feeling tired and somewhat unappreciated at this employment, he finally declined to reapply at the end of 2010 when his contract expired.

Faustino, as a key informant, and I had had many conversations about associations. From the first day I met Faustino in 2009, his vigorous, outgoing personality and propensity to drop a joke every so often into a serious conversation put me at ease. I had a standing invitation to visit his workshop and, after getting to know his wife too, to his home. I had thus come to know Faustino quite well, visiting him often, especially when I could not find anyone else at home, wanted updates on artisan activities, or worse, when my regular informants did not seem to be in the mood to talk. He was talkative with me, wanting, for instance, to get my thoughts about ideas he had for his ceramic business. (Most other artisans, by contrast, were often silent and reserved in the beginning, but opened up after multiple visits.) So at this point, I was comfortable asking about rumors I had heard as well as any new events that happened in the district that pertained to associations.

Faustino proceeded to answer my question: “I don’t think [the APA] is an organization. Neither have there been any meetings for over a year. Even now, it hasn’t gotten one order. Not even one,” Faustino explained, “The objective of an association should be to look for a market...

Rather [the APA] got us *un apoyo* [some support]... courses, field excursions... these small things, no? But an association should serve to help us look for and articulate ourselves with markets.”

In this chapter, I address this theme, the common evaluation “Associations don’t work for us” shared by almost all artisans in Quinua. These claims suggest uncomfortable contradictions between the main tenets of state-supported initiatives to stimulate local cooperation and the lived experiences of artisans hoping to grow their enterprises through these projects. On one hand, *artesanos*, like Faustino, and *artesano-campesinos*, like Roberto Gutierrez, all shared this sentiment and, importantly, many of the material experiences from which such producers of different sorts come to make such evaluations. These experiences included pressures to join, lack of communication and transparency, fraudulent uses of designs, embezzlement of development funds, and lack of concrete results. Producers in Quinua expressed deep frustration, hesitancy, and distrust towards these state supported, cooperative-like forms of local development. Elaborating and analyzing these claims becomes even more pertinent when we consider the wider historical trajectory of development projects in Quinua, where over eight business associations have been organized since the early 2000s. As Faustino and Roberto too, as I later discuss, illustrate, producers continue investing time and other resources into new projects that require organizing business associations. Against this backdrop, this chapter addresses these contradictions. Why did Faustino persist in using the same organizational model (i.e., business association) that, in his own words and experiences, had not produced the results he and other producers had hoped for? And, as I later found out, why did Roberto who had described being exploited by Faustino agree to join Faustino’s project for the Qenwa Ayllukuna group? What does it mean for producers of the *artesano-campesino* sort to not actually be members of associations but rather indirect

beneficiaries? Finally, what do these experiences tell us about the nature of current policies for local-based development?

This chapter examines personal and shared narratives of artisan workers in Quinua in order to uncover some of the reasons why local people may be hesitant about so-called community-based development projects. It also examines, at the same time, why locals, nonetheless, continue to take time and energy to engage in establishing the basis for, planning, and carrying out such projects. I argue that business associations, as emblematic of current neoliberal development that promote collective endeavors but also individual success, do not function the way policymakers and economists claimed they could work. That is, they do not work to strengthen a community of artisans or help to distribute wealth throughout the community. Instead, business associations have come to represent vehicles for individual and family advancement. In other words, local actors have coopted and accommodated business association structures, including resources funneled through them, to existing or traditional social bases, such as family and ritual kinship as well as relationships between *artesano-empresarios* and *artesano-campesinos*.

To make this argument, I go beyond the local to pay attention to the wider political economic dynamics that create different degrees and experiences of poverty. The case of the Peruvian district of Quinua demonstrates that community-based planning and implementation have a long history, one that development facilitators are not always open to analyzing. Rather than reifying certain concepts – including “development,” “community,” and “capitalism” – as discrete cohesive projects or structures set within discrete time frames, this chapter underscores the unevenness and ambiguities of these social formations.

In Quinua, producers have been part of a long trajectory of local development initiatives but are also embedded in regional, national, and international processes, including the unfolding of capitalism in Peru. Overall, profound transformations in the social relations structuring production and access to resources and power have contributed to the development of places like Quinua. Chapter 2 revealed how such concepts as “artisan” and “community” are grounded, for instance, in historical political economies and culturally inflected patterns of development interventions. Specifically, I showed how notions of “community” and “artisan” have been used by development planners in ways that romanticize and homogenize an internally diverse social, economic, and political space. I also analyzed how places like Quinua come into being partly through such concepts in the particular ways they are promoted by development planners. Thus, out of the twentieth century developed differentiated groups of artisan producers, including class-like subgroups I call *artesano-empresario*, *artesano-campesino*, and *artesano-independiente* as well as *ayudantes* and *peones*. The emergence of this differentiated population was dependent on early periods, such as the colonial era from which developed an incipient class of artisan producers mainly from rural communities who increasingly experienced the push-and-pull of newly emerging commodity markets in the region and elsewhere.

The present chapter, Chapter 3, hones in on more recent processes of change in local livelihood patterns as they are related to specific projects for business associations in the 2000s. I examine how top-down structures of business associations have intersected with social and political dynamics emerging from earlier time periods and experiences. I begin by analyzing official documents published by different organizations, such as CARE-Peru, because they reveal much of the conceptual basis for models of business associations in the Ayacucho region. I argue that on one hand, these models did take into account certain local realities, including

reliance on unpaid family labor, acquisition of skills via neighborliness, discourses of *confianza* (trust), and desires to improve livelihoods for everyone in the community. On the other hand, I further argue, the models reflect faulty assumptions about how these local dynamics and practices are employed by working people in their everyday lives. Through ethnographic analysis, I show, in contrast, how “relational” assets, like neighborliness and reciprocity, and other social features on which business associations were based, have mapped onto existing inequities. I also provide a deeper sense of the kinds of other pressures, motivations, and power structures – including changing economic and political situations –that compel local people to continually engage in exploitative relationships. I argue that not all people have equal opportunities to develop their trade through the kinds of formal and informal social networks promoted by current development models. The business association models, specifically, have essentially been constraining for the most disadvantaged producers.

In the following analysis, I tease out patterns across experiences of different producers. I show how projects of livelihood, production, and reproduction are as much projects of politics and power. The analytical work I do here builds on the work of scholars, such as William Roseberry (1989) and Eric Wolf (1982), who trace out the complicated syntheses of various production systems in Latin America and elsewhere. In particular, capitalist-like relations of production between wagedworkers or unpaid laborers and owners of the means of production are also relations between friends, family, and neighbors. All these human actors, whether members of the district, artisan workers, politicians, or development workers, bear their own specific interests in specific contexts, tied to their political or economic positions and ambitions. How people employ and engage each other in cooperative-like relations—even in capitalist markets,

then, is shaped in part by the multiple ways in which people are morally, politically, and economically situated.⁷⁴

The case of Quinoa producers and business associations therefore calls attention to the ways that individuals are always engaged – whether through coercion or desperation, friendship or family, or even disinterest – in multiple social projects and, further, how these projects interlock or collide with one another. This chapter addresses the internal politics of a rural village and, in the context of cooperation, a more immediately lived experience of intense personal pressure from significant social others (e.g., kin, friends, neighbors, male and female, authority figures) (Ortner 1995; Gledhill 2009). Rather than understanding the experiences of artisan producers with business association as signs of failure—of, for example, individual development projects or of producers’ inability to cooperate, revealing an inherent individualism, I contextualize these projects within the local social, political, and economic life of people living in the district of Quinoa. This particular feature of the chapter thus relies heavily on a number of authors who take a pragmatic, yet critical, approach to development policy. Pigg’s research in Nepal, for instance, shows how development plans do not simply “act on a stable field,” but rather development ideas enter social fields in which villagers “are already assuming and seeking certain relationships to development” and are viewing the latter “as a kind of social space to which programs give them access” (1997:281). Long (2001), similarly, has insisted on the importance of transcending conventional “images” of intervention that are limited to discrete projects and isolated from evolving social relations between social actors, including state institutions and officials. The concept of intervention, then, needs to be understood and

⁷⁴ Cooperation, whether based on “community,” “shared heritage,” or “family,” therefore, cannot be interpreted as being directly about joint operation of production (Cleaver 2000). Rather, cooperation and shared culture between different kinds of producers and workers are inextricably intertwined with the structuring of local hierarchy and how power is exercised (Roseberry 1989).

examined as “an ongoing, socially-constructed... negotiated” and experiential meaning-creating process (Long 2001:31). Such work calls for appreciation of the wider context of reform, and thus embraces both dominant tendencies of development and potentially multiple counter-tendencies (see also Arce and Long 2000; Bebbington 1999, 2000, 2005). In this way, so-called “external” factors become “internalized”; “clients” of development projects actively formulate and pursue their own projects of livelihood, where external interventions become resources for and constraints to their strategies of and interpretative frames (Giddens 1984). Ultimately, “transformations and interventions involved are, then, too complex and contingent to be judged simply as normatively desirable or not, as ‘success’ or ‘failure,’ as ‘development’ or ‘destruction’” (Bebbington 2000:496).

This approach allows me to make more apparent the often obscure and subtle counterwork performed on associational organizational models by local people. At the same time, it also allows me to highlight instances in which local actors actually reinforce these forms of development intervention. I offer an analysis that shows how artisan associations build on and reinforce the current neoliberal vocabulary of entrepreneurship -- specifically, an emphasis on community-based development and shared cultural identity while also culture of competitiveness.

Policy Work

Since the early 2000s, the key idea in international and national development policy has consistently been that carefully conceived collective action at the local level may advance whole groups of businesses in global markets and thereby increase national competitiveness. On one hand, these policies have celebrated cultural differences to tap grassroots organizations, to

promote entrepreneurship and participation among the rural poor (Davis 2001; Healy 2001; Kleymeyer 1994). On the other hand, they are in many ways compatible with neoliberal agendas in that they seek to transfer risk to the local/community level, encourage individual responsibility, and promote private enterprise and profitability (Wade 1997; Hale 2002; Gustafson 2002). This development strategy is a paradox: it encourages cooperative culture and “community” while creating expectations for individual responsibility with economic reward (Rose 1999, 2000; Veltmeyer 2008). The Plan for Competitiveness for the Ayacucho Region, the framework on which business associations in Quinua and elsewhere in the region were initially based, is emblematic of this current neoliberal strategy.

A slim book, published in 2001 by the NGO CARE-Peru, the US Agency for International Development, and a few other organizations sets out the Plan for Competitiveness for the Ayacucho Region. (Indacochea 2001). The front cover bears an image of a ceramic church from Quinua perched on a rooftop, setting up the imagery of an official document that celebrates cultural heritage. In building this image of celebrating Peru’s cultural richness, the first chapter establishes the social and cultural setting. It claims, for instance, that certain features of the region make it a singular space, in which discreet villages practice unique versions of Andean folk customs, speak particular dialects of Quechua, and exhibit Spanish-derived architecture that is inflected with local cultural features. These diverse, yet unified, features provide the region with its “historical and cultural identity”:

In this geographic region shared by Ayacucho, Apurimac and Huancavelica, the first inhabitants developed relations and linkages with Andean time and space that persists today and that enabled a cultural unity that is evident upon observing and analyzing its forms of social behavior, the world of ideas and its cultural creations in diverse fields (17).

A subsequent chapter focuses on the artisan sector, describing *artesanias* as works created manually, that is, without mechanical input. Each piece expresses cultural symbols valued by the producer and his community.

As the narrative moves forward, the protagonist increasingly shifts to “the producer” (in the singular) who looks upon his own culture as something of value and at himself as needing to change. The author describes, for instance, how *esquemas mentales* (mental schemes, or ways of thinking) impede economic success. These ways of thinking include disdain for wealth, chastising successful individuals, false attachment to mediocrity, low self-esteem, and inability to recognize that feelings of “the system can’t be changed” are all in the imagination. Furthermore, producers as individuals in the Ayacucho region have not yet developed the “social capital” to allow them to organize for production. Since the work is poorly paid, producers lack motivation and commitment to collectively tap into global markets.

The potential success of (individual) artisans, by contrast, lies in their ability to adopt, again in the author’s words, “nuevos paradigmas o esquemas mentales [new paradigms or ways of thinking]” (ibid.:56). These new ways of thinking implicate, essentially, entrepreneurial attitudes and vision, which are motivated by the possibility of monetary profit and wealth.

Explicitly:

For [artisans] it is necessary to overcome the weaknesses and limitations inherent in the production and commercialization of products, to project an image of innovation and to develop new products of quality for the global market. From the point of view of development, both the cultural and economic perspectives are complementary... In parallel to these processes, the formation of modern artisanal and competitive enterprises should also be promoted, taking on a culture of an entrepreneurial spirit. (103)

The few individuals who actively employ knowledge of other markets and realities – that is to say, “those who have left their place of origin, and, as such, have acquired a vision of the world necessary in looking for new horizons” (117) – are held up as exemplars of the entrepreneurial

spirit. These individuals have proven their ability to forge relationships beyond the local and to have overcome to some degree the centripetal forces of the local cultural milieu steeped in an ethos of mediocrity. They are the source of small-scale industriousness for concerted economic change and thus must be looked to for leadership.

The way of changing this collective ethos within individual action is through the presence of an outside group that will become the agent for change, creating new social structures that forge a new path of change:

The government and institutions have a preeminent role in the strengthening of social capital, since they generate the conditions for the organization of society. The capacity for change in social capital is the foundation of the evolution of societies. For this reason, it is said that acquisition of new ways of thinking accompanies the processes of transformation. In the case of Ayacucho, it is expected that the population will gradually abandon the ways of thinking that function as barriers for achieving competitiveness. (Indacochea 2001:56)

In line with the dominant development ideology, the path for progress outlined here is overwhelmingly the path for capitalist development. It emphasizes linkages between social, cultural, and economic aspects of production in the local context, and it is this feature that firmly places the Plan for Competitiveness in the camp of contemporary development schemes.

Such was the official argument for business associations. These organizational frameworks, because they were to be instituted by supposedly neutral entities like the State, provided a neutral arrangement of roles through which artisan producers could identify common needs, constraints and opportunities. It also draws directly on the “cluster” model put forward by Harvard Business professor Michael Porter, whose work has influenced economists, development specialists, and policymakers in Peru and throughout Latin America. As the cluster model foregrounds informal networks of rural producers in overcoming barriers to markets and productivity, so too does the Plan for Competitiveness. Enterprising men and women living and working close proximity have built up a common culture through everyday social practices, and

this fact alone facilitates sharing labor, technical skills, and market information. Local competition, in turn, pressures firms to lower costs and innovate to capture market shares. The local production system thus has many – but not all – of the necessary ingredients accordant with capitalist markets and self-help agency. Current efforts for development, then, now seek to “upgrade” these industrial clusters, that is, to fit the demands and contours of global capitalist markets, by creating business associations. Through these new market-oriented cooperative structures, producers may gain control of such local synergies.

Also honing in on the cultural-economic and historical legacy of the department, the International Labor Organization (ILO) executed an in-depth study of Ayacucho with a concentration of small-scale ventures in handicraft production in 2001. This study sought to explore the “dynamics of clustering and the way this could be stimulated in order to enhance the performance of the SMEs [small- and micro-enterprises] involved”¹ (Van Hulsen 2005:1). The aspects examined in this study were determined on basis of an evaluation of instruments used in existing studies on clusters (Becattini 1990; Marshall 1919; Pyke and Sengenberger 1992; Pyke *et al.* 1990; Porter 1990; San Martin Baldwin 1994). The researchers take as their starting point the concept of “industrial districts, where the unit of analysis needs to be not only one business but a cluster of businesses interconnected and localized in a limited geographical zone” (an Hulsen 2005:7). One of the main characteristics of the cluster, reports the authors, is that they are conceived as a social and economic totality. This social cohesion is measured not only by perception of a sociocultural framework through which local producers interact but also the activities in which entrepreneurial artisans have participated in collaborative activities. These observations are as follows:

1. Cohesion of the cluster: 50% of the producers participate in guilds or associations; 100% participated in joint activities during the last three years (to achieve commercialization,

- exchange of technology, buy materials, and participate in fairs).
2. Many artisans employ family members and other artisans “de confianza” to mobilize manual labor. Many workers circulate between artisans’ workshop given their physical proximity.
 3. Many artisans combine skills inherited from parents and grandparents (transmitting cultural value) with tendencies of modern markets.
 4. Inter-firm Cooperation in ceramics, 50% of the producers subcontracted preparation of the clay, 30% the molding and shining portions. In all the workshops the final touches were the exclusive work of the artisan.

The implication here is that artisans identify as a cohesive cultural community of traders, workers, and producers. Through “culture,” understood positively and instrumentally, producers have built of networks for sharing knowledge and other resources. This has been achieved in large measure by face-to-face interaction within families and the workplace.

These analyses are perplexing (and even vexing) given the methodological individualism of the neoliberal agenda moving their narratives along. They present to us a paradox. First, shared cultural and social space has naturally fostered a sense of identity and belonging, of a “we,” between people working in the artisan trade, and local villages should deploy these cultural resources in order to compete in global markets. They further have drawn on and sustained aspects of a “unique” cultural heritage of craftwork, a kind of cultural capital for engaging global markets. The image here is of a kind of imagined community, formed in opposition to other such imagined communities dotting the Ayacucho Valley. Images of and symbols from the past weigh heavily into the image making of such groups in the analysis, a simple continuity from past to present. The creation of fundamentally new communities (i.e., business associations) is presented in like step, that is, as simple continuity from the past. Specifically, local artisan producers are assumed to share an identity as tradespeople who belong to a community, marked by shared practices, values and beliefs. As long as the legal and structural aspects for associations were in place, then these positive feelings of shared identity

and belonging would implicitly transfer to associations, just as they had always done. These feelings of belonging to Quinua and sharing a craft heritage thereby provide the “social glue” to facilitate group solidarity, information sharing, and collective efficiency within the structures of associations. Further, the cultural differences between communities like Quinua (them) and the outside world (us) are presented as long-standing and traditional.

Second, however, the Plan for Competitiveness calls for *new* ways of thinking and *new* social organizations, seeking legitimacy by assigning to producers a past that is also obsolete and, in many cases, unproductive. It thus is able to call on producers to change other cultural elements, specifically attitudes and values that are unsuited to global capitalist markets. The author’s argument here holds local producers responsible for what is implicitly a cultural pathology⁷⁵ of mediocrity and conservative change. Their amorality in these peasant villages makes them backwards, and this is the “something” that is embedded in culture that makes people behave in a certain way, with which public intervention cannot deal with directly. The path though is, again, overwhelmingly the preferred route to capitalist enterprise. It encourages people to adopt an instrumental, entrepreneurial, and competitive attitude toward their cultural and social assets.

Similarly, the ILO report indicates that artisan firms exhibit strong familial ties, whose owners “are not willing to share with third parties some techniques of the process that they consider important” (Hernando and Van Hulsen 2001:37). Four paragraphs later, the report

⁷⁵ Oscar Lewis (1966, 1969), the culture of poverty thesis has been used to undermine the poor and, by extension, people of African descent. Lewis argued that poor people develop a subculture defined by some seventy social, economic, and character traits. Lewis, an anthropologist, looked at “poverty and its associated traits as a culture, or more accurately a subculture, with its own structure and rationale, as a way of life that is passed down from generation to generation along family lines” (1969:187). Similarly, Banfield (1967) had argued that Italian society was characterized by low interpersonal trust, reaching pathologically low levels in Southern Italy, where the prevailing outlook was “amoral familism”: the absence of feelings of trust and moral obligation toward anyone outside the nuclear family.

states, however, that socio-cultural characteristics of the entrepreneur do not constitute barriers for technological innovation. The author backs up this assertion by reminding us that 93% of the artisan entrepreneurs interviewed have changed their form of production as a result of skills training courses and/or a combination of experiences brought from outside. Further, inter-firm cooperation exhibits advancements through subcontracting and collaborative action taken in the areas of commercialization and other services. The socio-cultural factors have contributed to the apprenticing and exchange of specialized information at the familial level as well as inter-artisan relationships. Rather than interrogating how and why artisans are unwilling to share their secrets of the trade to people outside familial bonds, the report selectively emphasizes the positive aspects of relationships.

There are several fundamental problems with this argument. For one, the model conveniently sidesteps the complexity and messiness of everyday life. The “community” of producers and of Quinoa, in general, do not form an apolitical (though with differentiated economic roles) bloc, but exhibit important internal differences—diverse interests, experiences, and skills, among other things – that shape the local political economy. Three general issues, then, are elided in the model: “the *context* of inequality and contestation; the *process* of struggle and the place of naturalized and oppositional historical images within it; and the *production* of historical images themselves” (O’Brien and Roseberry 1991:12, italics in original). Secondly, and related to the first problem, one of the powerful effects of this development discourse is that it actually creates the *appearance* of systematic coherence out of a contingent and partly unsystematic nature of the very issues of contestation, struggle, and inequality. Not only does this apparent coherence reflect government agencies’ attempts in centuries past to define the Peruvian national community (although now constructed on cultural diversity), it also legitimizes

themselves as the builders of new and more efficient socioeconomic structures with roles that local people only need to enact.

Nonetheless, it was this pivotal idea that assumed a certain kind of continuity and change on which turned the CARE-Peru plan for Ayacucho and thus provided a conceptual basis for artisans associations in Quinua. It assumed a reified notion of “culture,” as if “culture” were constituted by objective characteristics of a population that, on an individual basis, may be sifted through and pieced apart in order to separate the desirable aspects from the undesirable ones. As I discuss in the next section, it obscured an understanding of culture as a process and as meaningful action shaped by relations of power and pressures of social others (Roseberry 1989). A reified understanding of culture overlooks preconceptions and previous understandings of social interactions and, further, how they would play into ventures to build associations. Thus, while the initial decision to support or join a business association was for local agents to make, their local relationships and structures, along with the meanings that villagers derived from them, conditioned their divergent responses to the associations.

I argue that business associations would have required attention to what really characterized the “community” of Quinua to which, as the model firmly establishes, ceramic producers belonged. If we delve deeper into artisans’ life histories, we begin to see how “relational” assets, like neighborliness and reciprocity, and other social features on which associations were based have mapped onto existing inequities. Significantly, craftwork in Quinua is marked by highly differentiated relations of production, and these relationships, characterized by the contradictory bonding of dependency and distinction, shaped the nature of associations. This means that it was not enough to simply create a network or social organization, like business associations; it is crucial that both scholars and practitioners of

development first examine the contents of and practices for these relationships. As William Roseberry (1989) maintains:

Real individuals and groups act in situations conditioned by their relationships with other individuals and groups, their jobs or their access to wealth and property, the power of the state, and their ideas—and the ideas of their fellows—about those relationships. Certain actions, and certain consequences of those actions, are possible while most other actions and consequences are impossible.” (Roseberry 1989:54)

People are situated in multiple ways in relation to their social networks, having specific but multi-dimensional social identities that shift according to context (Giddens 1984; Harvey 2000:102). This increases possibilities for variation, negotiation and accommodation, as well as conflict, in organizational management. That is, if individual people’s capacity to act is shaped through social arrangements, then we need to first understand the dynamics of individual and group social interactions and relations before a particular intervention is implemented. This allows us to understand how prior social arrangements potentially shape producers’ capacities to act within new social structures, such as associations. What is at once introduced by dominant groups as “tradition” is actually then reworked in new contexts. I now turn to showing how these complex and contingent dynamics have played out in the ethnographic setting.

Local Realities

The people I lived with in the district of Quinua Peru, as I showed in Chapter 2, are a heterogeneous population. We find in Quinua the town residents, many of whom have had some experience of migration, short- and long-term to both Ayacucho city and Lima. These experiences opened many of the town dwellers to new ideas and skills for how wellbeing could be, in their perspective, improved for them and their families. In the vast majority of these cases these residents had emerged from families with a long history of farming. Within this

population, five families emerged who were increasingly reliant on relatively gainful commercial artisan enterprises, the successors of which presently exhibit a degree of influence in Quinua's politics and economy. These individuals and their families rely more on craftwork and the occasional paid position with artisan development projects for their livelihoods. These people saw the development project for business associations as a means through which to gain an edge, both economically and artistically, in national and international markets. We also find in the town center independent artisan producers who also rely on craftwork for the most part, though they tend to focus on local and regional markets and some clients in Lima. In the outlying annexes, we find households firmly associated with the rural social organization centered around respective community hamlets. Among them are the farmers who rely less on craft skills and *ad hoc* jobs.

Among the five prominent artisan families who now reside in the town center (or very near to it) was Faustino Hausacca's family lineage of potters. Faustino learned to make ceramics from his late father, who was a talented artisan locally known for his skill in making pots and churches. Many artisans say that Faustino, having learned the craft from his father, is virtually the only *ollero* (one who makes pots) in Quinua these days, and is remarkably skilled at making large storage vessels and cooking pots as well as sculpting in clay. Faustino's two brothers also work in ceramic production, one in Ayacucho city and one in Lima working for a prominent artisan association. The three brothers sometimes sell each other their work if one sees a demand for another's work (e.g., when clients request particular designs or someone wants to diversify his range of products on offer), and in this way, Faustino was able to throw his marketing net wide.

Faustino identified as an *artesano*, set up a permanent *taller* (workshop), and legally registered his business as an *empresa*. He even had photos of a *coleccion* (standard model designs)—which he showed me on a dusty, outdated desktop computer in a storage room—for showing to prospective clients abroad. This placed him squarely in the *artesano-empresario* camp. Although he owned a few parcels of farmland, he hired people to work it while Faustino dedicated his time and energies to other livelihood activities, mostly ceramic production. His well-maintained workshop, a two-story adobe-brick building, sat adjacent to his family's two-story home, complete with cardboard signs marking sections of his workshop into various phases of ceramic production. His wife ran a food kiosk nearby, attending to the family's corner store in the home when she had time. Faustino's family lived fifteen minutes by foot, along a main highway, from the town center. They recently constructed a bathroom out of concrete, complete with running water for a shower and commode. Faustino worked in ceramics five days a week most of the time, saving some of his earnings in order to send his children to a high school in Ayacucho City in the future. Faustino had also worked four years in the *municipio*, helping the local government acquire a telephone, water system, a couple school buildings, and electricity for many of the community hamlets in the district. At the time of my fieldwork, Faustino was president of his community neighborhood located fifteen minutes by foot from the town center.

It seemed, too, that Faustino, as a local politician and active member of his neighborhood community, took on the responsibility of showing to outsiders the reality of how artisans in Quinoa live and work. “Nuestra realidad [Our reality],” he and other artisans called it. Part of this reality involved artisans' experiences with development projects to organize business associations, and Faustino, in his late thirties, had already belonged to two different artisan associations (one of which I refer to as the APA) at the time of my fieldwork. He had even

comprised part of the directive committee in both, and technically still acted as treasurer of one. The first association in which Faustino participated emerged, as did the APA (I will come to this later), from the Plan de Competitividad de Ayacucho.

In 1999, project facilitators of the first CARE-Peru project identified Faustino as a prominent artisan figure in Quinoa, having asked around town for people who owned a pottery business.⁷⁶ As an artisan, Faustino also stood out as having a degree of recognition for his work in Ayacucho as well as his family's reputation for making pots and churches. As a prominent and active member of town politics, he exhibited a high degree of "social capital." That is, he was outspoken for helping improve conditions and educational facilities in the district but also expressed motivation for making his ceramic business profitable. He thus exhibited shareable knowledge about ceramic production and marketing as well as potential to organize people into production channels. Alongside Faustino, other producers identified as prominent artisans included Cesar Orellana, two brothers Edgar and Miguel Cardenas, and several others who similarly were characterized as showing leadership, motivation, representative capacity, and social responsibility. In Quinoa, this meant being well-connected and politically involved in the community and beyond, producing full-time, and an accomplished artisan in commercial markets. Additionally, all of those selected were from the five prominent artisan families

From the outset then these projects chose key participants founded on a particular idea of an artisan producer, the "artisan entrepreneur," one who has been intensely involved in production of artisan goods, as well as generations before him (no women own their own

⁷⁶ Part of the initial process of identifying key actors for the projects involved inviting various artisan producers and representatives of public institutions and NGOs to workshops designated as "the most appropriate space that permits identification and convocation of key agents in the development of a culture of competitiveness, a nucleus of leaders that are denominated as an entrepreneurial driving force, a nucleus constituted by small-business owners, producers, representatives of local and regional government and NGOs" (CARE-Peru 19)

workshops), bearing characteristics of a recognizable Quinua tradition of ceramic-making. Widespread recognition depends to a large extent on an individual's family's socio-economic status, such that higher levels of one's parents' income has meant more education as well as networks outside of Quinua that often extend, importantly, to government offices in Huamanga, out of which any development projects are based. Thus the "target population" CARE deemed most likely to organize, lead and educate other artisans – artisans already demonstrating wide ranging social networks and higher degrees of success in commercializing their products – were, unsurprisingly, the village elites. CARE Peru plan did mention the link between accumulation of wealth and exploitation or corruption (57), and yet framed the issue as one where individuals must learn to see wealth as a product of hard work, effort and creativity, which is deserving of respect (57). The country and its regions need these creators of wealth because they promote the competitiveness of the whole. If everyone worked hard, as these individuals had, then, as an aggregate population, everyone would gain financially and thereby overcome the desire to corrupt and exploit.

As part of the introduction process, it was then explained to these artisans that these projects were to be implemented through a community-based organization, namely a legally constituted association. In Quinua, this meant that Faustino, Cesar, the two Cardenas brothers, and two others from one of the five prominent artisan families formed an association. In 2000 and 2001, they attended three or four participatory *Talleres de Competitividad Regional* (regional competitiveness workshops), consisting of two days each, which were intended to prepare these leading artisans to do the following:

- Understand the importance of competitiveness as a goal.
- Identify actual and potential competitive sectors.

- Understand and elaborate a shared vision for the region, defining the strategic direction for achieving regional competitiveness. (CARE-Peru)⁷⁷

Once again, assumed to be working as individuals, project planners hoped to instill in the leading producers to understand the importance of associational (read, cooperative) activities, that they become aware of the fact that individual efforts and capacities are insufficient for tapping into global markets.

Putting into action the lessons of the workshops, Faustino and the other prominent artisans established new community-based business association. In turn, CARE-Peru administered project funds that allowed the artisans to buy two electric potter's wheels, smaller hand-powered wheels, a grinder for processing clay, and other small tools to help standardize and speed up production. In legal terms, these resources belonged to the collective group, meaning that if the group disbanded, no one member could legally claim any of the material resources, even if the members reached an agreement. However, since the association lacked a collectively owned space to keep the items so that all members could use them equally, two artisans stored an electric wheel apiece while a third kept the grinder and other resources in their respective homes.

After months of holding meetings and workshops, divisions began appearing among the members, which a couple former members linked to national and regional political campaigns developing at the time. Several people at different times informed me that the president of the association pushed the then-current mayor of Quinua to support a certain presidential candidate at the national level while several of the other members of the association disagreed with this political alignment.

⁷⁷ A document published in 2007 by CARE Peru reveals that the majority of themes covered in these workshops focused on aspects of the economical model developed by Michael Porter in his book *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*.

“We entered into a little conflict,” lamented Faustino one day, “[the president] on his side and [the others] on their side. From then on we were paralyzed. We tried demanding that we use the wheels in their homes. ‘We don’t have time that day,’ they’d say.” Faustino turns somewhat hopeful, “Since then, we’ve [Faustino and those who were rumored to have taken the resources for themselves] become friendly... Sometimes I think about trying to organize the *socios* [association members] again, at least for a rotation system, to use the machines, I mean. We sacrificed a lot to get those machines! We spent months and months together in skills-training workshops... The group still exists. In name, at least. On paper in the public registers.”

This was the fate of the first association to which Faustino belonged. The electric wheels remain in the respective homes of the three artisans. One of them had actually advanced in using the electric wheel to the point that he is now known and requested for his vases, cups, and other utilitarian items thrown on the wheel. Another wheel sat unused in the corner of a second person who had since migrated out of Quinua to find wage work elsewhere. I personally have not seen the grinder but talked to the person who supposedly sequestered it away. He too no longer worked in ceramics at the time of my fieldwork and is even less inclined, if at all, to talk about his role in the association.⁷⁸

⁷⁸ On March 5th of 2011, while I was buying bread and fruit at a corner market in the Quinua center, this individual asked me just what it is that I am doing in Quinua since I have been here for some time now. I explained my project in general terms, knowing that he once worked in ceramics but never having talked to me about ceramics. The man proceeds to describe his brief venture into ceramic making, asking me which artisans I admired most, explaining how ceramics was not longer profitable, and so on. I mistakenly mentioned, with an air of keen interest, that I had heard of him: “Ahhh, yes! You did have an association!” (I knew better than to approach someone with information he or she had not told me him or herself. I got wrapped up in the excitement of his story and the fact that he was so forthcoming about his ideas for craftwork. It was often difficult to get certain people to open up about their work, especially if it involved some sort of local scandal.) At that, his demeanor changed quickly, as I noted his brow furrowing. “Yes, but associations... eh,” he remarked but did not finish his thought. That ended our conversation about ceramics for the remaining. The man did agree to an interview, suggesting another day and time. After that encounter, however, three different times I showed up on our agreed upon hour and day, but he was nowhere in sight.

In 2003, CARE-Peru, in coordination with FONCODES (which also provided funding), the NGO Cooperacion Tecnica Belga, and a few others, launched another participatory project centered on artisan producers in Quinua. The framework was once again based on the Plan de Competitividad de Ayacucho. Again, Faustino Hasacca and Cesar Orellana were approached by a project facilitator to join the project along with a third Cardenas brother (the other two had decided they had enough with associations), and (the son-in-law of an older artisan who was locally known but whose brother was nationally recognized). These three individuals once again formed the “entrepreneurial nucleus,” taking on positions of officeholders for a new association formed from the project. This time more *socios* (associations members) were to be included, and because of the desire for the project to be community driven, the task of choosing members of the associations was left to the “entrepreneurial core.” Cesar and Faustino, two of the three officers of the newly formed APA association, recall walking from house to house of people known for their ceramics and inviting to sign a paper document, complete with their National Identification Number, marking their formal membership.

The relationships between *artesano-empresario*, *artesano-independiente*, and *artesano-campesino*, characterized by the contradictory bonding of dependency and distinction, shaped the nature of the new association. Few artisan-peasants have participated in associations, and the few who have never held leadership positions. Life histories revealed numerous accounts of artisan-peasants initially being invited to join associations, having signed their names and providing a small entry fee. However, the lack of communication, intentional or unintentional, resulted in their inability to turn up to meetings reliably. These histories also revealed numerous experiences of deception on the part of leaders, who have tended to be among the *artesano-empresarios*.

By contrast, association partners tend to be *artesano-empreasrios* and *artesano-independientes*. Several of these producers, particularly *artesano-empresarios*, claimed that artisan-peasants cannot fully contribute to associations because they do not produce full-time. From this group five prominent artisan families have tended to dominate association projects. One or two male members of each, for instance, have acquired some leadership position of at least two associations at some point in their lives. They all reported that they learned of association projects from brothers, in-laws, or *compadres*, who work in some aspect of economic development in Ayacucho.

Roberto's and Faustino's narratives provide an illustrative comparison. Roberto, in his late 40s, learned ceramics from his father, "But my father is *desconocido* [unknown]," Roberto adds, referring to the fact that his father was never able to gain a name for himself as an artisan beyond his community hamlet. Roberto described himself as both a *campesino* and an artisan, depending on which livelihood activity he is talking about; sometimes he even referred to himself as "*un artesano del campo* [an artisan from the countryside]." When he was not tending to his fields, he made ceramics in a storage room adjacent to his family's aging adobe-brick home, located forty minutes by foot up steep, rocky terrain from the town center. The roof leaked, but Roberto didn't have time or resources to fix it. The family subsists mostly on potatoes and corn they harvest from two small plots, each less than an acre. They also obtain squash, herbs, and other products that grown in and around the corn and potatoes in small quantities. Anything the family cannot produce, like cooking oil, sugar, and school supplies for his younger children, they buy with the cash they make from Roberto's ceramic sales.

Roberto was an active and influential member of his community hamlet. He attended hamlet and district meetings to listen and contribute his thoughts on projections for the

community's future. Roberto participated in *ayni* with his neighbors and family members to plant and harvest their fields, offers extra foodstuffs to his friends and neighbors when he can, and participates in celebrations centered around agricultural and horticultural work in the community hamlet, and *safacasas* (ceremonies for celebrating the completion of a new house). On our first meeting, he held a *cargo* position at the annual *limpieza de sequia* (cleaning of irrigation canals, ensuring that soup, bread, and *puka picante* (a regional dish made with beets, peanuts, and a red pepper) were evenly distributed among participants. He verbally encouraged everyone during the closing ceremony to attend future irrigation canal cleaning events, describing it as a “responsibility of each family in order to care for their community and do their part.”

On that sunny July day, sitting wrapped up in a wool blanket and two layers of clothing, I listened to Roberto Gutierrez remember how in 2005 Faustino came knocking on his door. “[Faustino] said we’d receive better kilns and new designs. We’d be able to sell our ceramics for higher prices,” Roberto said. The conversation meandered around talk of ceramic knowledge—how hand-molded pieces were less likely to break than plaster-molded pieces, how natural paints did not change color over time like synthetic paints did, and, finally, how these did not make much of a difference in prices. The last topic guided Roberto back to talk of Faustino, and it came out that Roberto strongly resented Faustino for having struck a deal with a buyer using Roberto’s design. Although Faustino said he wanted to provide work for Roberto, he ended up completing the order himself.

Despite the rift happening before his invitation to the APA association, Roberto accepted Faustino’s offer to join. As part of his membership responsibilities, Roberto and the rest of the association members organized a *faena* (collective work parties involving family members,

compadres, and neighbors; traditionally organized to clean irrigation canals or repair communal houses) to construct a communal artisan building. Such collective performance of obligations enabled artisans to simultaneously sustain the association's collective wellbeing and reinforce their rights to access this cooperative network.

After two years, however, Roberto stopped attending meetings for the APA. He also did not receive a completed kiln, pottery discs, or shelving units, as other members had. He was told, reportedly, that he did not participate in all the meetings. Roberto said that if the coordinators had told him about the meetings, he would have gone to them, adding, "Some of the leaders don't even make ceramics. Go their houses, Yenni, you'll see. They're not even artisans," he tells me as I surveyed the "improved" kiln from the FONCODES project outside his workshop doorway. It sat without a door and thus unused. Faustino's words, when he talked of the electric wheel sitting unused, echoed in my head: "Ya, capital perdido. [Lost capital.]"

I found it even more intriguing that it was Faustino who had introduced me to Roberto in the first place. In talking about his recent project with the UNDP program (from the narrative opening this chapter), Faustino had encouraged me to talk to Roberto, who he had included in the list of "indirect beneficiaries." Once again, Roberto had agreed to work with Faustino in relation to a development project that required the formation and formalization of a business association.

In order to understand the ambiguous nature of the relationship between Faustino and Roberto, I need to return to that narrative opening this chapter. Wanting to add to his portfolio, Faustino had his sights on the UNDP's program since it offered funding for support and skills training for a year in four different sectors of the "cultural economy," including artisanal production, tourism, gastronomy, and organic agriculture. With the help of a current regional government worker, who was previously an artisan and from Quinoa, Faustino designed the

proposal for a project. The project combined cultural tourism and artisanry as a service his group would offer to people who wanted to visit Quinua to spend a few days with artisans to learn how people in Quinua make ceramics.

Sitting in a plastic chair, Faustino smoothed the seams of a small, clay Virgin Mary figure with his finger, carefully set it down, and handed me a thin, spiraled report. It contained the details the project presented to the UNDP program. I thumbed through the document as Faustino offered his abbreviated version. The group consisted of eight people from Quinu. Most of them were family members but also included a few neighbors who worked sporadically in his workshop. Faustino explained his choices for membership:

We always work with family. The association is something familial because when there are a lot of people [implying not of the family] it won't work. Also, in my workshop, I work with family. Even my children and mother participate. They're my *ayudantes*. My brothers and sisters, too, when there's a large order, we get help from them... it's also to help better the conditions of our lives, of each family member, no?

Non-family members living and working in neighboring community hamlets will also benefit from the project, "a little," Faustino adds, in terms of skills training courses and articulation with markets. "These people are dedicated to making ceramics that are entirely traditional... Like me... Almost the majority of them," Faustino described.

He then proceeded to list off the names of the twenty-four people who would ostensibly benefit from the project should it receive funding – Roberto Gutierrez was among them. Faustino described over half as making *ceramica tradicional*, like *urpus*, *toro* (bull) pitchers, *qarqacha* (two-headed llama) pitcher, *ukumari* (half-woman, half-bear mythical creature), plates of different sizes, *toqtoq* (vessels for toasting corn), as well as spherical and curved-contoured vessels for carrying liquids (e.g., *aysaku*, *yukupuyunu*, *tachu*, and *tumin*). "There are people who don't belong to any association, people who work with traditional technique and who are in the

campo [rural countryside]. They aren't directly linked to exportation, above all. They produce mostly for stores in the *pueblo* [town center], for the galleries of the *pueblo*," Faustino clarified.

I was struck that Faustino aligned himself with artisans who made *ceramica tradicional*. Glancing at the wood-plank shelves lining the workshop walls, I surveyed the batches of standardized miniature clay figures – all made with plaster molds and colored with synthetically produced paint. Most artisans in Quinua described the sorts of techniques and designs to make these goods as non-traditional and as commercial. At the same time, however, I had heard that Faustino was highly skilled in making pots and other cooking vessels *a mano* (by hand), the kinds of that were “netamente de Quinua” (purely from Quinua).

“I don't understand, Faustino. Why aren't these people all *socios*? If they're participating in the project and will get something out of it...” I asked.

“Why did we put these names?” Faustino began, “Because they asked me to... These [names]. They weren't signed or anything. We just presented them... because [the people with the project] called me at the last minute, and they said to me, ‘You all need, more or less, twenty beneficiaries. If not, [the project] won't pass,’ they said. To justify more than anything... But I put down those that work, no? We always work with them... when there are skills training courses, for example, or when there's an event, we invite them, no? That is, they're not direct beneficiaries. They're indirect.”

These “traditional potters,” however, were not invited to be members of the association because “when there are a lot of people it won't work.” This commentary led me to suspect that Faustino had experienced similar issues with non-family producers as did another prominent artisan who explained that “it's a lot easier to come to decisions and agreements between family.

There's too much disagreement between *ajenos* [other people outside the family]." I heard others employ the term *desconocidos*, or unknown people.

Faustino's explication is illuminating. For one, Faustino drew on the discourse of *ayudante*, which implied that familial bonds between him and others have allowed him to draw on the labor performed by these individuals without explicit or immediate remuneration. Rather, family members as *ayudantes* took part as a responsibility in maintaining and contributing to the livelihood of the family. At the same time, as head of both household and ceramic production, Faustino carried more weight in terms of the decisions and actions taken by family members regarding their livelihood endeavors. These dynamics, shaped by internal power relations legitimized by social norms, underscored the ambiguous relationship between economic labor and familial relationships.

In addition, infusing this narrative of family and friendship was a complimentary discourse of "tradition," one that contrasted with previous decades of development projects that tended to focus on mass production of industrial products (see Chapter 2). By simultaneously promoting and juxtaposing the district's "traditional" artesano-campesinos and artesano-empresarios ("modern" is implied), producers sought to turn the district into a touristic commodity. Key among this construct was a myth of modernity, one that simultaneously lauded the creation of a "modern" town center and its "traditional" campesino (rural) counterpart. Elites, like Faustino, incorporated long-standing production practices with more "modern" business practices to create an ambiguous fusion.

So, producers like Faustino who pursued entrepreneurial identities linked to global markets now *needed* producers like Roberto who employed skills and designs now designated as "heritage," owing to their role as carriers of historical values from the past. Producers like

Faustino, however, now have the institutional capacity, via business associations that allow for “indirect beneficiaries,” to maintain critical distance from producers who were not in their immediate networks of family and friends.

Contradictions and Negotiation

So why did artisans of all sorts continue to participate in business associations? By the time I conducted my research in the district of Quinua in 2010 and 2011, I found almost no sign of popular support that the decade old studies described in 2001. Far from being seen as the source of solutions, associations – and with them NGOs and the state actors – were seen as major aspects of the problem. Indeed, many NGO actors, government representatives and artisans were increasingly talking about the *desconfianza* and individualism precisely because the projects from which the first associations emerged in Quinua were implemented poorly.

For certain groups of producers in Quinua, particularly the *artesano-campesinos*, the possibility to choose the terms of their engagement in business associations was negligible and the likelihood of them consenting to these state-sanctioned relationships very high. With few options to earn cash, however, development projects for artisans (which more often than not demand participants must participate as an association) promised new markets, product improvement, and business know-how.

In emphasizing the socially situated nature of action, I thus also saw artisans’ as constantly compromising and re-positioning themselves in response to conflicting priorities. For artisans, this has involved deferral, absenteeism, accommodation, and selective appropriation as they try to negotiate the overlapping relationships with which their livelihoods are intertwined. The type of social patterns predominating varied between town center and satellite communities,

or hamlets, of the district. Membership of associations was largely for accessing development aid such as business skills-training, design and quality-control courses, and improved kilns and other production inputs. The maintenance of people's social positioning in relation to associations depends on being perceived as "well connected," "produces full-time," and an accomplished artisan. Such reputation was not necessarily secured and reinforced by willing participation in village events, but by the capacity, materially and symbolically, to participate in national and international commercial markets for crafts.

This form of social positioning stands in contrast to other kinds of social positioning, particularly in relation to kin and wider social relationships in the district.

In the outlying community hamlets of the district, where many people pursue mixed agricultural and artisan livelihoods; associational life revolved much more around "traditional" collective labor arrangements, like *ayni* and *minga*, singing and dancing groups for burials and communal celebrations, and public events such as *limpieza de la sequia*. "Traditional" ceremonies of peasant artisans in Quinua participated by contributing chickens, corn, coca leaves, and cane alcohol or locally made corn beer. These forms of social positioning depend on being seen as "hardworking," "trustworthy," and "good people." Such reputation is secured and reinforced by willing participation in family, village, and other communal events, but is viewed as unnecessary and even wasteful according to the entrepreneurial logics of capital investment and risk-taking.

So, artisan producers made use of business associations, but *how* they used them shifted, and it is here where producers accommodated associations to their particular interests and capacities. Many artisans in Quinua claim membership to at least two of five cooperatives existing in Quinua. Membership fees are not rigorously enforced, lists of members are not strictly maintained, and membership changes constantly. Member artisans admit to not

convening regularly outside of those sporadic moments when external institutions offer grants of production materials or skills training.⁷⁹ Even a communal artisan building, intended as shared production space, currently serves as storage space for two association leaders. Such collective spaces, as artisans indicate in personal narratives, could contribute to continual renewal of social bonds between members. Indeed, members talk in personal conversations about the need for open discussion and debate about how they might use this building for common purposes.

Thus, rather than interpreting fragility of business associations as a sign of definitive failure and artisans' engagement with associations as outright resistance, artisans have taken, transformed, and turned associations to their own creative purposes (Bebbington 2000). Discourses of *conformismo*, or acceptance of a less than ideal situation, in artisans' personal narratives mediate their concerns for perceivable problems of fragility. However, artisans' degree of participation reflects a certain, though very limited, kind of agency. As artisans shift membership from one association to another, for instance, they are maneuvering within and beyond constraints more politically and economically powerful others may place on them, whether it involve members' mutual mistrust, power and corruption of leaders, or periods of collective decisional incapacity. Additionally, the majority of artisan producers, even *artesano-empresarios*, circulate rumors sanctioning coordinators for using the association's name to secure product orders that are filled by only a few, wealthier artisans. By manipulating associations, these "leaders" gain "unfair" market advantage over other artisans who counter that

⁷⁹ Arce (2006) similarly found that while the Peruvian social fund, FONCODES, achieved distributing resources to the poorest:

it provided little incentive for nucleos to remain organized beyond the completion of the small projects. Indeed, most base-level community organizations that participated in the program tended to be project-specific. On average, these organizations lasted approximately four months, approximately the period required to execute a project. The absence of enduring organizations or stakeholders suggests that the impact of FONCODES on civil society has been mostly direct, immediate, short-term, and highly contingent on a constant flow of relief funds, indicating that across time the benefits of the projects were widely dispersed. (2006:45)

these leaders are not “true” Quinoa artisans. As *artesano-empresarios* observe less-than motivated fellow producers for participating in associations, they, too, have found ways of accommodating business associations in more recent years, as we saw in the case of Faustino who has chosen to work primarily with family and ritual *kin*.

Concluding Remarks

The shared evaluations of associations suggest uncomfortable contradictions between the main tenets of state-supported initiatives to stimulate local cooperation and the lived experiences of artisans hoping to grow their enterprises through these projects. Previously excluded from development decisions that affect their livelihoods and seeking a voice in how they engage national and global markets, artisans have chosen to participate in collective resource sharing. Community-based organizations, however, have been perpetually frustrated by highly differentiated networks of varying partnerships.

This chapter analyzed these state projects to organize business associations. Development specialists intended this particular form of local cooperation to encourage efficiency and entrepreneurship in support of shared craft and cultural identity for national competitiveness in global markets. This chapter thus argued that while this strategy can be successful to a point, it also overlooks existing inequities in targeted communities. Resources funneled through associations have provided business development services to small firms and producers. While many local artisans and family firms have benefitted from improved kilns, courses for design innovation, and internet marketing, business associations have also contributed to older inequalities and hierarchy. Program facilitators selected leaders with individual entrepreneurial potential, who were also influential, prominent, and well-informed

people in the Quinoa district. In this way, business association projects unintentionally promoted a type of exclusionary development, rewarding existing economic “winners” and further marginalizing disadvantaged producers.

However, this is hardly a case of a dominant model of agenda and ideas being imposed on people on the ground. Rural producers continuously reinterpret and transform projects even as they claim to be carrying out internationally and state funded mandates. This chapter thus demonstrated how these local actors work within and navigate these opportunity structures to pursue individual and collective ends, engaging the language of cooperation and community, along with discourses of exploitation and unfair manipulation, in many different ways. In most respects, these actors offer quite a different image of “community” and shared craft traditions than that framed by dominant officials discourse for neoliberal development models.

At issue, too, is how more disadvantaged artisans have disputed these elite claims. Many artisans, as I mentioned, claimed that certain people benefitting from associations are not “true” Quinoa artisans. Drawing on narratives of a tradition, to which no one person can claim sole ownership, artisans negotiated meanings about fair and unfair competition in contexts of formal associations. Similar to the preceding argument, then, the next chapter shows how conflicting values and goals emerge from real material differences between artisans, making present-day strategies to build cooperation and community problematic. It shows that while strategies for building local cooperation may involve expression of symbolic and material value of artisan interdependencies, they may also in certain contexts constitute arenas in which new and older patterns of differentiation emerge.

CHAPTER 4

A WORLD OF DIFFERENCE

Imitation, Conventionality, and Authenticity

You may copy me, but you will never equal me.

<<< >>>

Rafael Flores was just seven or eight years of age when he first participated in a class offered at the local Artisan school established by the Ministry of Education in 1965. Since Rafael's father did not work in pottery (he relied primarily on farming), like the fathers of Rafael's contemporaries in Quinua, he learned basic skills from a professor at the school. He recalls having developed a real *animo* for the craft from this experience. His professor, Mamerto Sanchez, was one of the earliest potters to have sold his wares for cash to a family of merchants from Ayacucho. By the time young Rafael left grade school, artisans from the district had already established a foothold, albeit insecure, in international markets. Some of these artisans, including Rafael's professor, received invitations to attend national artisan fairs and requests to supply pieces to museums and private collections and shops. Rafael remembers that the ceramics made leading up to this boom in sales were *mas acabadito* (finished more finely with more detail) and were *mas bonito* (more beautiful). He himself experimented with different stylistic features that he observed other artisans using to make these fine pieces and felt proud that he developed his own styles. As Rafael explained:

The clay was born from within me. I participated a little in the artisan school, where I learned a few steps from professor Mamerto Sanchez. They offered [this instruction] to various students. But really the details and ideas for my pieces came from my own inspiration. Even today, I don't make the same kinds of pieces as professor Mamerto.

Our work is very different from the professor's. We respect him. He's a master artisan. He uses original paints used by our ancestors.

On that afternoon, we were nestled on benches in the warmth of his kitchen, a small, low-roofed area behind his workshop. As we spoke, Quinua's thick gray clouds crowded in the sky, blocking any possibility for the sun's rays to warm the air and sending more raindrops as reinforcement. A heap of broken and charred pottery vessels lay discarded nearby underneath the worn bench that Rafael's wife huddled over. She was preparing an Andean dish made from sautéed potatoes, garlic, and *yuyu* (a wild plant with yellow flowers), using ashes to cut the bitterness of the *yuyu* leaves. Rafael had invited me to his home for this particular meal, as I had effusively conveyed to him how much I enjoyed it, and so that we could talk more easily while he relaxed after finishing his ceramic work for the day. Rafael mused over my subsequent question about his personal style:

It's difficult [to protect our designs]. We artisans, we live from this, no? We can't say 'don't do that [copy this design]'. The artisans who come before us, well, we live from them. *Los antiguos* [the ancient ones] have to be followed, too ... Waiting for new works so that these too give value to their [*los antiguos*] works. If we continue using the same designs, we're not valuing *los antiguos* ... and what other option is there for us? There is no other option. So I say, if I sell more of these [pieces that everyone sells], I'm just settling. But if I don't sell these, I have to look for another [design]. This is how I'm inspired. This work I no longer sell, but it's better that I make another. So this little thing inspires me. The traditional or whatever can inspire me. And it's even better if I can sell to the public, no? And so, one makes a decision this way. If not, I'm settling for what I'm already making. I'm not thinking how to create new and better works. An artisan has to look for new values, to look for new prestige.

Well aware of the increasing tensions between producers over copying and design imitation, Rafael struggled to define where imitation ended and creativity began, and how the work of those before him, who he calls "los antiguos," ambiguously fuses with contemporary pottery made in Quinua. His struggle was not uncommon, as everyone who I talked to about ceramic

production, including workshop owners, hired workers, development specialists, and government officials, either hinted at or overtly described struggles over creativity and imitation.

The eloquence of Rafael's explanation is nonetheless striking, as much for his patient acceptance of ambiguity between imitation and innovation as for his certainty that it pushed him to develop himself as an artisan and as a workshop owner. It is with this kind of self-conscious attitude that Rafael is convinced a true artisan should approach his and others' craft. If other people copied his work, it was only because he had accomplished something, however small a detail, worth copying. Convinced that learning from skilled master artisans and subsequently developing one's own style was the only way to get ahead in the work of ceramics, he points out even the smallest of changes in design detail – like the youthfulness of a figure, the shape of a bell tower, or the type of roof on a church – that make his work authentically his own. He says that even his own son, eighteen years old, must eventually figure out what inspires him personally and develop his own style. He adds too, “[if someone copies,] it's like a hand giving one more piece of bread to another, so that they too can eat.”

<<< >>>

Keeping Rafael's narration in mind, I discuss in this chapter local notions of authenticity. I want to highlight how artisans in Quinoa conceived of authenticity, which, I argue, is encapsulated by local terms, ideas, and material practices surrounding *artesano verdadero*. Specifically, artisans self-consciously struggle to balance crafting daringly close replicas of others' designs, mixing and matching their own and others' stylistic elements, and creating new designs. Certainly, not everyone expressed these tensions between personal styles exactly the same way. While Rafael, for instance, saw ambiguity as motivating personal style, other artisans summed up their sentiments in the following: “You may copy me, but you may never equal me.”

Still, every artisan explained to me in some way or another that if a person is to be a “true artisan,” he must develop his own style.

This chapter explores multiple layers of values, norms, and modes of moral and economic reasoning that inform how Quinoa potters understand their work, including practices of copying and imitation criminalized as IP theft. In the course of this analysis, I discuss personal narratives of people trying to earn a living amidst rising insecurities while also struggling to pursue personal, social, and moral desires for their craftwork. The formal illegal nature of copying designs was only an afterthought for artisans, as an issue that did not directly affect them (see also Thomas 2011, 2012). Rather copying and imitation among producers and of competitive behavior in general are evaluated locally in light of ideologies of kinship as well as moral and social ideas about authenticity and creativity. While the former encourages the sharing of knowledge and resources (as a vernacular and loosely defined property regime) among certain networks of family intimacy, the latter compelled producers to set themselves apart from everyone through developing a personal style.

Local notions of authenticity and creativity are critical to examining official models and business practices as well as development promoted in neoliberal policy agendas. Formal IPRs are a core feature of national and international economic development, not unlike Hernando de Soto’s (1989) plan to grant formal land titles to poor populations in Latin American cities. Like formal land titles, IPRs too were intended to create the institutional conditions for giving traction to nations’ entrepreneurial potentials via profitable innovation. Following a neoliberal logic (and similar to social relationships in the context of business associations in Chapter 3), cultural symbols and skills are valuable for economic endeavors, and are to be managed as such.

I argue, however, that there are significant gaps between these formal ideas about intellectual property and local ideas about creativity. Locally, handmade pottery is considered more prestigious among the various techniques of ceramic making. Yet, the men I worked with saw certain techniques, such as plaster molds and borrowing designs elements, as both necessary for producing in a fast paced trade. And, although their design work was often limited to what they thought would sell in the marketplace and thus shaped by the demands of national and global tastes, many took great satisfaction in creating new designs, even if “new” or “original” were based on seemingly insignificant and small details.

Thus, even in a context of claims to personal style, producers simultaneously employ shared aesthetic conventions, techniques, and symbols. Following Becker (1982:34), producers in Quinua are necessarily embedded in “art worlds,” which is to say that they constitute networks of people whose artistic activities are organized around shared conventions and agreed ways of doing things. These shared practices enable the quality of looking-alike between pieces so that they all reference a well-known model. It is ultimately this redundancy of pieces that is essential to official and public recognition and marketing of “traditional techniques” and “traditional knowledge” (TK) as authentically “Ceramic crafts of Quinua.” This chapter then brings nuance to different understandings of “authenticity,” showing how they overlap and conflict in complex ways, in local craft production. It also importantly shows how people working in the ceramic industry manage the delicate balance of maintaining control over their craft and cultural heritage while engaging potentially fickle markets.

Within this context too, however, artisans persistently evaluated each other based on these practices. So this chapter also analyzes artisans’ struggles of appropriation – seemingly mimetic encounters between artisans who share, borrow, reuse, and even “steal” stylistic and

technical elements from others. But I am not necessarily interested in similarities and differences between ceramic objects themselves, or whether these constitute “authentic” manifestations of a cultural heritage of ceramic making in the Quinua area. Rather, I highlight the relationships between artisans as they debate, negotiate, and even overlook material practices of and meanings surrounding appropriation. What makes these relationships particularly tense lies in how artisans differently, and sometimes contradictorily, interpret their and others’ practices of appropriation: appropriation may be a way of maintaining a community’s craft tradition, a livelihood strategy, a socially offensive act, a sign of unoriginality, or even a creative technique. Even Rafael, in subsequent conversations, spoke of another artisan who initially contracted one of his sample designs for a large order but later ended up filling the order using workers from his own workshop. Many artisans tell such stories of design “theft” and exploitation, which contrast with accounts of sharing designs between neighbors and discourses of “community tradition.” In this chapter, then, I focus on the narratives artisans tell themselves and others about who they are, and are not, as artisans, and thereby make claims about and debate who counts and who does not as an artisan. What I argue is that artisans’ accounts and struggles over imitation and innovation, as well as notions of authenticity and authentic tradition, are not merely economic matters, but also social and political as well as intensely personal.

This chapter builds on the work of scholars who have obliged us to show how diverse agents – as necessarily interested individuals, groups, or institutions – work to tell stories to authenticate the nature and value of particular objects. I shift analysis, however, from how people create a world of authentic or, in Kopytoff’s (1986) terms, “genuine objects”, to focus on how people create a world of authentic selves, and by implication, less than authentic others. This framework opens analytical space for showing one very important way in which *who*, rather

than *what*, may be considered authentic in certain contexts, particularly in Latin America and amongst artisan populations. Rather than asking how “that honorific title – art – is fought over, what actions it justifies, and what users of it can get away with (Becker 1982:131-64), I ask in this essay how the title of “*artesano verdadero*” is fought over and debated, what actions are justified as well as contested, and the contradictions emerging within narratives told by users of it. I ground one such view in ideas about creative people. Artisans I interviewed in Quinua consistently linked creativity with authenticity and, specifically, “*artesano verdadero*.” In this local language of authenticity, originality, uniqueness, and seemingly non-replicable qualities conspicuously stand out. Yet, the requirement of shared tradition, in claiming that a ceramic object distinctly originated from Quinua, means that no person can innovate so uniquely as to be considered entirely outside the local cultural calculus.

While the present chapter relates to my overall emphasis on development as a process marked by conflict and cooperation, tensions between the personal and the social, it focuses on a decidedly different temporal frame in that the project for the DO and collective mark for Quinua is still in the earliest stages of implementation. It was only after I had returned to Quinua in July of 2012 that artisans had actually been actively involved in drafting regulation of the use and maintenance of a collective mark for ceramics made in the district. By contrast, the previous chapter described and analyzed business associations, for which the general idea and practices have been circulating and negotiated for over a decade. Thus, issues surrounding business associations are more entrenched and part of everyday livelihoods in Quinua. The notion and practices surrounding a collective mark are relatively recent and, therefore, less diffuse. Even so, if we seek to understand development as a process, then we are compelled to understand, too, how the two projects - business associations and collective marks – are and will potentially

articulate. This approach is especially important in understanding how existing processes of exclusion and inclusion that, as I argued in the previous chapter, shape and are shaped by business associations also shape local understandings of “shared heritage” and “collective tradition,” ideas that are central to collective brands.

Doppelgangers at the Market

Wandering through any tourist marketplace in Peru, you would unavoidably note the rows of seemingly identical objects, placed side by side on display shelves. You might also observe similarities of hand-made artifacts perusing a popular art gallery in Lima. Such repetition and seriality of a craft, often glossed as “tradition” or “cultural heritage,” emerges, in part, from shared material production practices and aesthetic conventions. As Steiner (1999) argues, this gives coherence and visibility to a shared craft in markets. Even tourists, after one or two trips to a Peruvian craft market, may be able to identify the miniature churches or typical white-on-red color scheme identified with Quinua ceramics. Aesthetic repetition, as a marketing strategy, is thus crucial to making products by artisans in Quinua identifiable to a broad population. In this context, it is artisans’ strategies of appropriation—sharing, borrowing, reusing, and even “stealing” stylistic and technical details—that gives a sense of contiguity to artisan products.

Scholars of expressive cultural production in Peru – whether called *artesanía*, *arte popular*, *arte vernacular*, or *expresión plástica* – have also called attention to unique cultural and technical aspects of artisan work in Peru. (e.g., Fuente, et al. 1992; Ravines and Villiger 1989; Sabogal Wiesse 1979; Spahni 1966; Tschopik 1949). In one of the most well-read books on *arte popular* in Peru, Francisco Stastny tells us that “[a]mong present-day potters villages, one of the

most active and successful is Quinua, in Aya- cucho” (Stastny 1968:111). Dean E. Arnold, in an ethnoarchaeologi- cal and ecological analysis of pottery making, states:

Quinua ceramics are unique in the Ayacucho Valley. No other pottery made in the valley approaches that of Quinua in the diversity of vessel shapes, flexibility of expression, and the complexity of its decoration. These characteristics also make Quinua Pottery one of the most complex and diverse contemporary ceramic products of the entire Peruvian highlands. Quinua pottery is also unique to Latin America. Its pottery (churches, bulls, and other shapes) is exported to worldwide markets and is available in import shops in New York, Chicago, San Diego, Milwaukee and Europe. (1993:15)

Fuente et al. relate how the craft has been passed down between generations:

In the past, Quinua was a center inhabited by ‘*olleros*’ . . . It is difficult to discern exactly when ceramic objects in Quinua began to have a ceremonial function. The ceramicist Otcochocco initiated the production of these objects, who was followed by Dionisio Lope and Faustino Nolasco, of the Inkacasa community, located below Quinua. Another follower of the idea [to make ceram- ics for ceremonial use] was Francisco Sanchez, known by the nickname ‘*Al aire*’ [literally meaning “to the air”] . . . According to artisans in the area, this name was given to him because his ceramics were so fine that they appeared as if blown by air. His son Santos Sanchez, known as ‘*Niño al aire*’ [“Child to the air”], was a fine ceramicist . . . The son of [Santos] is Mamerto Sánchez, creator of so many new forms we see today. (1992:80-81)

Various government administrations too have pursued the economic and symbolic potential of artisan production. A recent government-backed development project *De mi tierra, Un producto*, for instance, selected Quinua in 2012 to receive development assistance. The program’s website describes Quinua as: “one of the most enchanting villages of Ayacucho... inhabited by talented artisans that mold clay with mastery, creating works of art whose motifs represent and express daily life and emotion, just as their Huarpa and Wari ancestors did” (PromPerú 2012). These sorts of development projects are part of a historically situated and explicit move by development specialists to invest in the symbolic component of market goods. More importantly, current policies designed around the cultural sector center on the role of “creative workers,” like artisans, who are said to drive the creation of new products. And these products, in turn, create new markets - nationally and abroad. It is this vision that now underpins

much national economic policy in Latin America, under the “information society” label, a label that focuses on creative activities, innovation systems, and the competitive advantage of nations.

Furthermore, culture, as a code for diversity and as a resource, has acquired an unheralded prominence in national development plans. George Yudice, one of the most well known scholars to sustain and critique this idea, points out that culture in contemporary societies is employed “as an expedient for the improvement of things sociopolitical as much as of things economic” (Yúdice 2002: 23 and 2003). In other words, “representations of and claims to cultural difference... multiply commodities and empower community” (Yúdice, 2003:25; see also Coombe, Schnoor, and Ahmed 2006). In this way, popular culture (rituals, everyday aesthetic practices like songs, customs, and other symbols) serves as a resource for stimulating tourism and promotion of industries that exploit cultural patrimony.

Cultural diversity specifically linked with creativity is recognized as powerful drivers of development. The potential of the interface among creativity, culture, economics and technology, has been more recently stated, and explicitly so, in *Creative Economy Report 2008: The Challenge of Assessing the Creative Economy* (UNCTAD, UNDP, UNESCO, WIPO, & ITC 2008):

Creativity is found in all societies and countries – rich or poor, large or small, advanced or developing. The word “creativity” is associated with originality, imagination, inspiration, ingenuity and inventiveness. It is an inner characteristic of individuals to be imaginative and express ideas; associated with knowledge, these ideas are the essence of intellectual capital. Similarly, every society has its stock of intangible cultural capital articulated by people’s identity and values. Civilizations since time immemorial have been aware of these concepts. However, the twenty-first century has seen a growing understanding of the interface between creativity, culture and economics, the rationale behind the emerging concept of the “creative economy”. (3)

Cultural complexity and diversity under current conditions of global connectivity may well be harnessed “creatively” for development and democracy.

In Peru, this way of deploying culture, in its intangible form, manifests in various practices and discourses. Craftwork took a forefront position of priority within the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism (MINCETUR) emphasized the important role that it plays within the national economy. Handicraft exports from Peru amounted to \$69.9 million in 2012. According to Jose Luis Silva, MINCETUR's head, the Ministry "seeks to encourage and stimulate artisans to continue to developing their talents for the benefit of all Peruvian... to keep the country's culture alive. 'We want Peruvian craftsmanship to be respected, appreciated and valued by all that that is behind it: ancestral knowledge, specialized skills, but above all, identity and culture'" (ANDINA 2013a). Minister of Tourism Mercedes Araoz, during a ceremony to celebrate the National Craftsman day in the city of Ayacucho stated, "Our handicrafts are a reflection of our culture and make Peru an attractive destination for tourists and the true identity of the craftsmen is revealed though the beauty and textures of the products they manufacture" (ANDINA 2013b). Culture is increasingly called upon for its potential to promote conscientious citizens and contribute to the national economy.

For policy and development specialists who are concerned with managing the cultural aspect of the economy, the focus has been increasing on encouraging the "new competition." In the "new competition", innovation relies on creativity in the generation of new products and services. Organizations may thus become configured to value creativity and innovation as sources of competitive advantage rather than as additional costs. Hence, this type of competition emphasizes loose networks of enterprises that mix and match skills and expertise to produce short runs of new products and services of high quality at short notice. With creativity and innovation at a premium in rapidly changing product ranges, the key question for policy is how to maximize creativity and innovation in any individual, enterprise, region or economy. In

response, government agencies have developed a series of programs and awards that create spaces for networking, for showcasing talent, for doing business and which facilitate collaboration and business skills development.

This pursuit of creativity, however, as one standard for public and private support raises the question: how do we identify which artist-artisans or “creatives” to support? This question is particularly at issue for what is disparagingly called time and again “tourist art” or “airport art”. I show, by contrast, that producers prioritize creativity in making even these sorts of mass-produced and standardized objects. I want to stress at this point too that mobilization of “creativity” in policies obscures ambiguities and slippage within and of these concepts at the local level. So, for instance, during my time in Quinua, I often saw artisans reuse older elements, combining them in new ways. They also shared these new designs with family members or sold them to friends and neighbors. Even one well-known ceramic maker, Efraín, locally referred to as a “true artisan,” draws inspiration from older ceramic styles and techniques known to Quinua, that is, he uses naturally-derived red and white pigments and models each piece by hand. He learned this style and the techniques from his father and grandfather, and which he later used in developing his personal creative style. Other people, too, identified as “true artisans” remarked how they learned technical skills and some stylistic elements as apprentices of Efraín but later developed their own style. All artisans, even “true artisans”, in this way depend on each other to recreate the styles of a recognizable craft. And from this shared repertoire every artisan not only fashions his business, but also his sense of self as an artisan producer. In this context, local notions of authenticity are constituted by both 1) personal creativity *and* 2) collective ideas and practices. In other words, innovative and imitative qualities comeingle in objects, but not unambiguously or comfortably so.

To reconcile these differences, Quinoa ceramics have been categorized into objects for ritual use, for domestic use, and for decorative use (e.g., Arnold 1993; Ebersole 1968; Fuente et al. 1992; Ravines and Villiger 1989; Stastny 1968). Similarly, many scholars and development specialists have attempted to identify different sorts of producers. For instance, Sabogal Wiese distinguishes between “indigenous artisan,” “artisan- worker,” “pseudo-artisan,” and “vernacular artist” (1979:6). A 2001 International Labor Organization study of development potentials of artisan work in the Ayacucho region distinguishes between “master artisan,” “innovator artisan,” and “local artisan” (Hernando and van Hulsen 2001:i). Although classifying phenomena into categories is useful in many situations, it hinders our understanding of locally constructed concepts as well as how people in artisan communities seek to make sense of anomalous cases—that is, cases that meet some, but not all, of the criteria expressed by such concepts (Becker 1982). In this way, externally derived categories obscure ambiguities, contradictions, and slippage between them. By attending to how people in Quinoa socially construct or create social types, we are better positioned to see “the ambiguities of [folk] terms and the contradictions between what they predict and what the world exhibits” (Becker 1978:863). Thus, while much has been written about artisan production in Quinoa, far less understood is how people working to make ceramic products experience, talk about, and try to come to grips with the ambiguities of sameness and differentness of objects and, further, how these understandings articulate with their sense of who they are as creative laborers.

Multiple Significations

Over a year of working with artisans in workshops, market stalls, and even during strictly nonmarket activities, I heard all artisans recount, often with frustration, experiences with design

copying and theft. Many artisans in different parts of the world are similarly pre-occupied with copying and daringly close replicas of their products but, importantly, for different reasons. As Steiner argues for African art markets, for instance, acts of imitation may enable strategic market positioning. Indeed, a part of Quinua ceramic object's value "depends not on its originality or uniqueness but on its conformity to 'traditional' style, [where] displays of nearly identical objects side by side [in a market] underscore to prospective tourist buyers that these artworks indeed 'fit the mold,'" or conform to a "traditional" style (Steiner 1999, 95). This critique, however, offers only a partial view, and a particular understanding of a creator's relationship to objects he or she produces as market-oriented. It therefore does not help explain why producers in Quinua make distinctions between not only their products but also each other as creators. Many artisans in Quinua, in some respects, also view imitation as a way of legitimating the skill of a predecessor, paying homage to generations before them, or keeping their cultural heritage alive. An artisan named Juan described this to me: "*Los antiguos* have to be followed, too. . . . Waiting for new works so that these too give value to their [*los antiguos*'] works. If we continue using the same designs, we are not valuing *los antiguos*." This cultural phenomenon has been found to operate similarly amongst Asante woodcarvers (Silver 1981, 1983). Yet in their conversations with each other and me, artisans drew implicit distinctions between copying and sharing designs. An artisan, on one hand, may explain how he preserves technical aspects, spiritual myths, and everyday practices—elements that are said to belong to the community—by reusing older design elements in his pieces. He may also, however, criticize others' pieces as mere copies, explaining they offer little economic and cultural value. The point I want to make for the case of Quinua, therefore, is that anxieties about design copying are not the same as positive feelings associated with sharing a craft tradition.

Writers on the sociology of art and culture provide a framework that opens analytical space for both negotiations of values and a relational understanding of aesthetic criteria (e.g., Becker 1974, 1976, 1982; Bourdieu 1983). Becker (1982) for instance, points out that even the most apparently individual of works can be the result of collaboration (even if the work is attributed to one author), while Bourdieu (1983) focuses on struggles occurring between individuals. Colloredo-Mansfeld, Androsio, and Jones (2011), through an analysis of Otavaleño weavers, highlight both cooperation and conflict:

Amid the robbery of designs, the lost earnings, and the mutual suspicions, artisans were also materializing a foundation of a market. This base drew from the changeability of fashion, commitments to an economy with an indigenous identity, and interdependence of working side-by-side in a provincial market town. The circulation of ideas . . . contribute to a kind of economic commons. . . a base of designs and goods with value linked with some notion of indigenism—although (and this is crucial) such contributions are rarely intentional. (41)

The authors further show that while many complain of rivals who “sent someone to their showroom to buy a sample under false pretenses, or ‘spied on their shop windows from the street corner,’” just as many producers perceived copying as a “reassuring sign of connection” (Colloredo-Mansfeld, Androsio, and Jones 2011:45). The shared value of ideas contributes both to an artisan’s enterprise and to an individual’s sense of personal and collective self. Simultaneously, copying and conflicts over appropriating ideas reflect concerns about market value and competition: the more daringly close ceramic objects appear, the more they are likely to compete for the attention of prospective buyers. Artisan producers thus seek to capture the economic value by differentiating their products from one another through creativity and innovation. What differs between the Ecuadorian case and the Peruvian case is that producers in Quinua are particularly adamant about personal identity, particularly linked to the notion of creativity. So while creativity is oriented toward innovating to create new and better products, it

is also socially imbued with a particularly nonmonetary value (although these different valuations are inextricably intertwined).

Personal Imprints: Producer Narratives

Once in describing why he enjoyed making ceramics, and had done so for more than twenty years, the artisan Manuel said that in working with clay, “*Uno se deja sus huellas con sus dedos.*” He pressed his index finger into a lumpy mass of soft clay, leaving behind an oval-shaped indentation. Quite literally, the artisan leaves behind the marks of his fingers after having used them to massage, pinch and pull wet clay in shaping an object. Here, we begin to see how people’s impressions of themselves, of who they are as artisans, begin to emerge from direct bodily engagement with the material of clay.⁸⁰ On one hand, the raw material of clay, particularly as it shaped from an abstract mass of raw material to a specified form, extends the body-person of the artisan, leaving imprints on the surface of the clay (Gowlland 2009).⁸¹ For Manuel, his fingers, and, by extension, his hands and the rest of his embodied person, leaves one very observable and physical manifestation of himself as creator. He later fires the clay, after maybe shaping it into an animal figure or miniature church, and puts it up for display in his shop or market stall. In this way, then, these personal markings of the creator and thus a sense of who he is as a maker become more permanent and visible for future artisans, buyers, and other observers.

⁸⁰ Objects made from clay, I suggest, become a kind of extended person, an argument derived from Alfred Gell’s (1998) conception of art as a transfer of properties and agency of persons to things. Rather than simply a transfer, however, where the objects themselves may possess capacity to affect certain processes while circulating in different networks, engagement between person as creator and clay material is a mutually constituted extension.

⁸¹ See Gowlland (2009) for a comparative case of *Zisha* pottery making in China.

On the other hand, the clay material, its physical properties bearing a kind of agency, affects the artisan as creator. Artisans' narratives reflected in various ways the importance of this mutual engagement with clay. Producers, for instance, often complained that many producers *hacer por hacer* (make for the sake of making). One artisan elaborated on this idea, explaining that such producers are not engaging the head (*la cabeza*) while engaging the hands (*los manos*).⁸² Another artisan described it thus: "Without emotion one can have ability, but there is no art, there is no creativity." People make objects, which necessarily requires their hands, but they are not using their creativity, which necessarily requires their head and hands working in conjunction. One may master technical skills in manipulating materials of the craft, but to become a true artisan one must also master non-technical faculties locally referenced as *emoción* (emotion) or *espíritu de creatividad* (spirit of creativity) or simply as "*mi creatividad*" (my creativity). Artisans in Quinua consistently stressed the importance of *creatividad* in setting a true artisan apart from all others working in ceramic production.

One artisan named Carlos helped me understand this process. He explained learning creativity as the following: "With your hands you make different little models, and you learn more too. You learn what difficulties you have in making ceramics. You learn what small differences you can make. And so I have to model using my hands, to get more practice." The clay and person are mutually constituted, each being transformed by the other in their conjunction. Artisans continually emphasized this predilection for creativity for making objects and curiosity for the clay as a fundamental aspect of artisan identities in Quinua.

⁸² This conceptualization is different from the mind/body dualism so often critiqued by anthropologists and other scholars. Rather than viewing creativity as located in an immaterial mind and distinguishable from a material body, artisans conceptualized creativity in terms of materiality of the head-hands and distinguishable from materiality of hands making alone. This is a process recognized by several writers and commentators on creativity in artistic practices (e.g., Sennett 2008).

Creatividad, moreover, was cited as an essential element in the longer process of learning to make ceramics. In making an object, there is a clearly definable task at hand, which is to be achieved by one person in conjunction with a mass of clay. This single act of creating, temporarily suspended in time and place, in which materials, tools and maker interact, however, may be, and often is, for many producers part of a longer process of ceramic making. In describing how they learned to make ceramics, every artisan emphasized how their physical engagement with clay often spanned over many years, perhaps four, ten, or twenty years, and sometimes more. Thus, finger impressions literally and metaphorically reference this process, just as they reference the more momentary mutually constituted relationship between clay material and body-person maker. In this long process, if a person is to be a “true artisan,” he must become familiar with the physical malleability of clay, to learn directly with the hands and other bodily senses the clay’s limits and potential for creating things. With embodied mastery of technical skills, an artisan must, at the same time, self-consciously familiarize himself with the malleability of his own imaginative faculties. He must learn directly, through exploration and experimentation as the artisan’s hands engage the immediacy of clay, the limits and potential of his creativity.

Social Commitment and Values of Personal Authenticity

At this point in my analysis, one might conclude that local conceptions of authenticity, grounded in ideas about personal creativity, support modern views of authenticity in the context of artistic practices. In these views, authentically creative persons are defined as special individuals, whose work distinguishes them as persons set apart, or, better, above, the masses⁸³.

⁸³ See Taylor (1991) for an extended discussion.

But this view is problematic because it sets the authentic creative person against tradition, where the creative person must struggle for originality over imposed cultural rules. “What gets lost,” as Charles Taylor argues, “in this critique is the moral force of the ideal of authenticity” (1992:17). My analysis thus far hints of this moral force in local understandings of authenticity, since artisans define and evaluate personal identity of themselves and each other within a set of shared values (for creativity). Following Becker and Bourdieu, I now shift to an explicit focus on the *socially* constructed and agreed upon moral nature of authenticity. In other words, creative laborers in Quinua are necessarily enmeshed in a broader social space or arena.

While imprints left by fingers reference a person’s physical engagement and personal identity, for artisans they are also symbolic of their social identity. As these marks materialize on ceramic objects, referencing personal artisan identities, they are also up for display, as I mentioned before, for other artisans and observers. Along with these marks of the body are made other marks of the creator, such as the particular color combinations he chooses, in the particular way he forms the shape of an eye or paints on a plant design, and in other small details. This fluid convergence of personal marks are thus also up for display in public spaces. Artisans insisted, for instance, that each artisan has his *sello* (stamp) or *estilo* (style). Each artist’s style of executing the complex combination of colors visibly distinguished his work and accentuated the individual character of Quinua ceramics.⁸⁴ Developing a personal style depends on both individual, creative flair and technical mastery of manipulating clay. It also depends on manipulation of established, albeit flexible, conventions governing the use of materials, the

⁸⁴ Also see Femenias (2005) and Gowlland (2009) for comparison. Gowlland, for instance, argues that “the actions of the body-person imprints on the surface of the clay; the sum of skilled movements performed in proper sequence come to mark the pot with the signs of the maker” (2009:138).

choice of colors, the use of local cultural themes, and other elements of design and content (Becker 1982).

For example, consider these bull pitchers, each made by a different artisan:



Each artisan worked within a similar set of stylistic and symbolic elements, most prominently the typical white-on-red color scheme and the bull form of the pitcher used to serve *chicha* at community fiestas. Yet, we also see that the four artisans used similar elements to create four distinct pieces. Artisans thus “use available materials to produce works which, in size, form, design and colour, and content, fit into the available spaces and into people’s ability to respond appropriately” (Becker 1982:229). Notably, when I showed photos of these pieces (which were

all on public display) to several artisans, most were fairly accurate in naming the creator of each piece⁸⁵. Each clay object often bears socially recognizable marks of the artist who made it.

Artisans insisted that a person, if he is to be a true artisan, must develop this personal style, and, further, continue to do so to set himself apart in a world of social others who all draw on a shared repertoire of symbols and styles of a recognizable Quinoa tradition of ceramic making. The individual who puts the piece up for sale or buys it advertises his proficiency. Displaying and selling ceramic objects therefore put artisans' personal identities on the line, exposing their creative choices to public scrutiny and judgement. Ceramic objects in the rural Quinoa district, much as Blenda Femenias (2005) found for producers of *bordados* in rural Cuylloma Province of Peru, become a ground for social evaluation where people must prove their creativity in seeking to gain respect as a "true artisan".

"You May Copy Me, but You Will Never Equal Me."

Artisans in Quinoa persistently stressed the connection between shared technical skills and symbols used in making ceramics and the creative skills, talent, and vision of the individual creator. Many even acknowledged that, practically speaking, it is entirely impossible to execute an exact replication of another person's work or style, given individual tastes and abilities. So if each artisan is said to have their own style, then why do artisans make social distinctions and argumentative claims about one's own and other's authenticity? Part of the explanation, I argue next, is grounded in ideas about copying, specifically in relation to values for creativity. For this argument, I turn to Bourdieu, who, like Becker, conceives of creative practices as occurring

⁸⁵ Other scholars have similarly noted the ability of artisans to differentiate their styles by visual cues (e.g. Femenias 2005, Gowlland 2009).

within certain social relations, but these are characterized by antagonism and power struggles rather than cooperation.

The primary source of inspiration, artisans reported, is other pieces of ceramics⁸⁶. Skilled artisans design them in clay, using tools, without looking at a model. Well-trained artisans, therefore, need not directly copy others' work to be directly influenced by it or may design from memory a design seen only once, especially since most pieces draw on shared aesthetic conventions. An artisan named Eduardo, for instance, who produced small piggy banks told me how he came across this design while working, and simultaneously learning how to make ceramics, in a larger workshop for another artisan. Eduardo made a small change to produce his personal design. As he reconstructed the pig form in clay from memory, he bent its ears to make them appear "floppy" and "realistic", a detail, Eduardo said, based on countless observations of living pigs.

These material practices of aesthetic borrowing and appropriation provide material mediums through which relationships are built. Artisans negotiate the circulation and reuse of their designs amongst each other. In illustrating how this may happen, Rafael picked up the unfinished piece he was working on when I arrived, holding it up for comparison: "They are almost the same, no? But this [older model] I gave to someone else to produce. I gave him the mold. This is how an artisan works. He may sell or not sell it. He may sell it to me or to other workshops." Artisans may sell and buy designs to other artisans, a transfer mediated by plaster molds bearing the design. In other cases, an artisan might peer into another's shop to observe what ceramic pieces he is making while walking to the town center for the Sunday market. One

⁸⁶ Artisans also mentioned newspapers, television, and books as well as everyday events and special occasions in the community as other sources for inspiration. Artisans in Quinua, however, most often appropriate design and stylistic elements from other artisans' goods.

might also observe pieces by the many artisans who put their products up for sale in the tourist market-stalls near the town's central food market. More commonly cited by my informants, artisans buy a finished piece of ceramics from a shop or artisan fair from which to mold using plaster in his home workshop. One instance, after I had described to an artisan some cooking pots I had seen in another workshop, to which the artisan responded, "You should bring me back some of those, Yenni. I could copy them and make them here to sell in our shop."

I, too, came to see differences in styles, as small as they were, during the countless hours I spent observing ceramic objects in workshops, galleries, tourist stalls, and artisan fairs in Peru. Initially, I was incredulous as to how very small differences in details, colors, and form mattered, but the artisans showed me just how important they were. Rafael, on that insightful afternoon, guided me through the process. He picked up a photograph of a ceramic church and grabbed a finished church from the shelf.

"I have new designs too," Rafael insisted, "This model [in the photograph] is from Chincheros [in Peru]... But this one [the finished piece] is of another variety. They are a little different, no? Really different... the people-figures are younger [on my piece] ... [But my piece] is already out of fashion. I have a new version already," he says.

Rafael continued to point out the changes made by another artisan to what was once Rafael's design of the church: a priest-figure exchanged for a peasant woman, a cactus where there once was empty space, and a tiled roof exchanged for an *ichu* grass-thatched roof. I noted this conversation in particular because it was the first time anyone had verbally described, and ironically with such clarity, the ambiguity of imitation and innovation. The mold used to make these churches were the same, the sizes were the same, but even the smallest change in what I

had once thought were negligible details made for artisans, literally and figuratively, a world of difference in and for their work.

This process of conservative modification, or “editing” (Becker 1982), characterizes creative practices in Quinua; artisans orient themselves according to a shared repertoire of a Quinua style, gained from countless observations of other people’s ceramic works, which enables innovation and improvisation. Importantly, however, such impressions of personal style are not always reliable proof of its creator, particularly given apparently small changes and variation in design details marking personal styles. It is these apparently minor variations within a common currency of designs that give rise to conflicts; artisans accuse each other of copying their original, unique design. In this context of quasi-identical objects, seemingly small variations and changes become socially significant details.

When artisans spoke of others as copying or described others’ accusations of copying, these comments almost always articulated with ideas about authenticity grounded in moral and social values. The family owning the workshop in which Eduardo had seen the piggy bank design, for instance, approached Eduardo, asking him why he copied their design. Eduardo rejoined that the design did not belong exclusively to them, explaining that “the design belongs to Quinua... everyone makes it now.” Eduardo legitimated his use of the design by citing a social fact, that is, aesthetic conventions shared within the district. In this regard, Herzfeld’s (2004) study of Grecian artisans is extremely suggestive. He states:

A strong analogy subsists between the production of objects and the crafting of selfhood ... Grecians prioritize expression of individuality, though not to be equated with originality, through deft manipulation of clearly defined conventions ... Every swashbuckling act of animal theft, every daredevil acrobatic step by the man leading a line of his fellows in dance, every clever verse and every matching riposte – each of these demonstrations of masculine competence is an elaboration of recognizable form, to which too precise an adherence sits ill with aggressive insouciance of swaggering manhood, but from which too great a departure elicits disapproval and contempt (2004:38-40).

Accusations about design imitation, artisans said, also indicated that a person lacked self-esteem. “If an artisan is worried about others copying his work,” one artisan explained, “then he is not confident in himself and his creativity,” implying that only a true artisan is unconcerned when others copy his work because he knows and demonstrates that, as a craftsman, he and his creative skills are equal to no other. And conversely, no one can equal him even if he dares try.

Plaster molds, plaster artisans

One aspect of ceramic production in Quinua that provided a particularly salient source of conversation and debate about copying as well as in artisans’ desires to show how they were true artisans are plaster molds. I recall one afternoon when I asked an artisan named Efraín, who was working at the time on hand coiling a water pitcher, if he used molds. At the time, it seemed a common enough question, since I had seen every artisan use plaster molds in some way or another. Further, molds allowed artisans to produce in a standardized way and at a much faster pace than did modeling each piece by hand alone.

A plaster mold is used to create duplicate copies of utilitarian, decorative, or even more complex works of art through a process called casting. The mold itself is a negative or mirror image of the final work. To give some background, the type of mold technology used currently by potters in Peru was introduced in the 1960s in Lima by state-supported programs, like the Alliance for Progress. People working in artisans industries who have moved, permanently or temporarily, between Quinua, Ayacucho and Lima city brought this mold technology back to Quinua and have integrated it into their production practices. Since the 1960s, this technology has been encouraged by different organizations and institutions, and in many cases directly in Quinua. Many such projects, as part of state-led and internationally supported development

policies, have promoted artisanship as a type of industrial production, mainly for exporting artisan goods. So, plaster molds enabled this sort of production and have allowed producers to access wider economic circuits.

Returning to my conversation with the artisan, Efraín stated, after laying down the rock he used to evenly smooth the coiled-clay walls of the pitcher, “No. I only make pieces by hand. Hand-made pieces have their value. Each piece is unique. With molds, there’s no difference in the pieces.” One might stop here to argue that artisans defined authenticity as based in objects that are unique, purely made by hand, and carry a higher market value. Objects made with molds are, by contrast, serial copies, inauthentic, and cheap. But consider this statement made by Efraín as our conversation about molds and artisan work in general in Quinoa unfolded: “Nobody equals me. Nobody!” he exclaimed. “I can’t say I’m the only one making ceramics, but these people, they don’t equal me.” Efraín made not so much a comparative claim about his work versus others’s work, but more so one about him as a person and creator as compared to others who make ceramics objects. Within Efraín’s exclamation, market values ambiguously infuse with values for a sense of self, of Efraín’s perception that he is a uniquely creative person. For most artisans, too, this material practice of using molds versus hand modeling techniques was a constant source of social evaluation, bringing the value of one-of-a-kind creative person into the social realm.

Additional contextual clues relating to Efraín’s assertion that he definitively does not use molds reveals the ambiguous and often contradictory nature of imitation and innovation. Later I found out that Efraín had asked his daughter-in-law to make small people figures using her plaster molds. Efraín integrated these molded figures into a piece that he wanted to use to enter a national artisan contest. A few other artisans in Quinoa, when they saw this piece, remarked that

Efraín had used molds to make this piece. “So why should *he* win?” they asked. In doing so, they attempted to diminish Efraín’s authenticity as an artisan. In general, it is not uncommon to find such contradictions among artisans in Quinua. Many artisans criticize others’ use of molds or downplay their own use of molds, even though every artisan either used molds to produce or bought plaster-molded pieces from others to quickly fill their shops. My question is thus: If molds practically help artisans produce and earn a better living for themselves and their families, why are they so preoccupied with their own and others’ use of molds? What are the stakes in making such claims?

Artisans who used molds, a type of technology for duplication, and could thus produce faster certainly increased competition between each other for sales. Indeed, artisans complained about lost sales due to introduction of mold technology in general.

Felipe here is making a mold from a stallion sculpture that he himself designed and modeled in clay. As he and his wife, Felicita, worked to create the mold, he conveyed that he enjoyed designing such unique pieces because it allowed him to be creative. Making the mold, Felipe said, would help him produce faster without working so hard to make each piece entirely by hand. Many other artisans made plaster molds from one “original” design, which, an artisan may tell you, originated in his workshop. From these molds were made serial copies to increase his and his family’s production output, but this increased his ability to compete with his neighbors for attention from prospective buyers.

The anxieties around molds, however, most prominently emerged when the so-called original piece presumably belonged to an artisan other than the one who created the plaster mold. Specifically, producers often talked about molds in the context of copying and robbery of designs (“*robar mi diseño*”) as a moral and social offense. My conversation with the artisan

Carlos (mentioned previously) helped me to understand why imitating others was such a social, moral and personal offense. His comments, to remind the reader, relate back to my argument that finger impressions and details marked on clay objects reflect an artisan's creative identity, but what I did not mention was that Carlos was explicitly speaking about the relationship between creativity, copying, and mold use.

"One is not an artisan, if he uses only molds," Carlos further explained, "He is not thinking, not using his creativity. Molds are to advance in one's work. With your hands you make different little models, and you learn more too. You learn what difficulties you have in making ceramics. You learn what small differences you can make. And so I have to model using my hands, to get more practice. If not...if I am just making with plaster molds...then I am settling on the same."

Comments like Carlos' express a kind of awareness that molds, as a form of technology, affected confluent processes of separation. In one sense, molds physically separated the artisan from his clay medium because the artisan used his hands less to form the clay, the mold acting as a partial proxy. But this contracted experience of direct contact with clay also meant that the artisan spent less time and energy thinking and creating in clay since the mold, in bearing a pre-determined design, did a good part of the image-making and creative work for the artisan. Carlos further pointed out to me the material signs of this process of separation. "Hand-made pieces cost you a little more time. You need higher temperature [for the kiln]. And when it's fired well, it sounds like metal," he explained, knocking on a fired, hand-modeled piece of ceramic. "If it's not fired well, it doesn't sound like this," he continued, knocking for comparative purposes on a plaster-molded ceramic piece. Indeed, I could hear the difference, the latter being a more muted sound. Inhering in the material properties of a finished ceramic object was an irrefutable test of

technical mastery, accessible to human sensory experience and thus materially grounded source for social evaluation and proving oneself to be a true artisan.

Carlos continued further: “Molds leave these small seams here, within,” he points out on a plaster-molded piece, “Just by looking at it, this was made with a mold. If you look inside this [hand-modeled] piece, it doesn’t have seams. With a mold, it looks like this. Wiping with a sponge, you can see it.”

Herein also lay a material test of creativity, wherein one substitutes impressions of fingers with non-human marks (e.g., seams of a plaster mold); wherein one simultaneously risks replacing creativity with mere copying and ultimately risks being evaluated as anything but a true artisan. So at the heart of much of artisans’ struggles to minimize others work as unoriginal and mold-made lied deeper anxieties. Molds separated artisans from their creative potential and mastery of technical skills and by extension their identities as authentic and true artisans.

In this way, it exemplifies what Nash (1993b:131) describes how changes in capital within production processes of artisanal practices, visible as the transfer of technology (e.g. machinery or machinery parts), alter small-scale production. Specifically, production formerly controlled by the household becomes production in which only input the household makes is labor. Nash is concerned to show how the loss of access to resources, while enabling the survival of artisanal endeavors, involves an undervaluing of labor but also speeding up production and developing new types of products. To some extent, the use of new technology involves a parallel process of “de-skilling”: artisans no longer use the skills needed to perform a task now completed by a machine. Artisans thus tend to lose these skills. However, it is not just skills that artisans seem fear losing. To rely on molds for production primarily is to submit one’s inner creative spirit to the outer dictates of capitalist markets. Submitting to fixed forms of

designs threatens to rob producers of their creative potential and agency that is rightfully theirs, personally and collectively.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

I began this dissertation by introducing Roberto Gutierrez who accused other artisans of stealing his designs, appropriating development aid for personal use, and shoring up markets at the expense of others. Roberto also used methods and designs handed down for generations, in which he took great pride. He valued hard work, which, he believed, should be invested in shared tasks that would contribute to the wellbeing of his family, his *comunidad* (community hamlet), and even fellow artisans. Roberto's experiences are suggestive of the tensions arising from the texture of relationships between the self and others in the world. This dissertation has engaged the complexity of these tensions emerging when dealing with social relations, including cooperation, unity and collaboration as well as conflicts and competing obligations. I showed that for potters in Quinua, arguments over moral obligations were an existential experience shaping relationships between the self and others in the world, crosscutting material and symbolic realms, and oscillating between unity and conflict, cooperation and competition. Drawing on research conducted in the southern Peruvian highlands, this dissertation has offered insight into the value of ethnography in exploring these dynamics among a population in which wellbeing is largely attributed to harmonious social relations.

My research also touched on how others who interacted with artisan producers also recounted the conflicts of Quinua producers. Development workers and state officials, as well as shopkeepers responsible for commercial exchanges, and inhabitants of Ayacucho city referred to the “selfish” and “individualistic” character of artisans. The notion that *los artesanos de Quinua*

son individualistas (the artisans of Quinua are individualists) and *hay mucho egoismo en Quinua* (there is a lot of selfishness in Quinua) was widely claimed and widely shared in different ways by a significant number of people both inside and outside the district. It is easy to blame the “individualistic” and “selfish” (“bad”) behavior of producers when they are the only actors in this story. This is especially so when conflict and disagreement are portrayed as an exception to a specific behavior deemed desirable, as a morally condemned feature of a particular human population.

Although potters share many of the negative interpretations described by external actors, for Quinua people, conflict and differences between them is also significantly different, being very explicit in people’s narratives and actions, whilst constituting a core feature of social life. Thus this dissertation shows that people who work in the artisan trade are not just reducible to the craft they perform. Neither is their identity reducible to a strictly “artisan” one, whatever that may be in certain contexts, nor their social relationships reducible to valuations of their use in the market. There are other aspects to be considered in scholarly and development practices for engaging them.

In recognizing local producers’ relationships as dynamic and often ambiguous – that is, both exploitative and meaningful, as cooperative and conflictive, I have connected the social, political, economic changes taking place in Quinua and in the Ayacucho region to multiple processes and ideologies employed by dominant development institutions to capture, remake, and revalue cultural and social assets for the global market – that is, in David Harvey’s terms, forms of accumulation by dispossession. This has required a political and moral economic as well as historical approach, and I have surveyed the period prior to Spanish colonization to contemporary contexts of artisan production in the Ayacucho region. In my analysis of history, I

showed how specific attributes of activities involving people making objects – by hand, family enterprise, shared tradition – became the basis for economic competitive and growth strategies through the production of difference.

The preceding chapters have also shown how the invention of tradition, notions of class and “ethnic branding” of certain productive activities, and the expansion and defense of markets has played heavily into social constructions of identity and relationships as marketable. Production then has taken place not just in local workshops and homes but throughout craft commodity networks involving development institutions and agents, and with it a redistribution of power and inequality. This brings me to tourist and export markets: in producing the social and cultural for these capitalist markets, the unseen product of global craft networks is ultimately the unequal power relationships that lie at the heart of processes of dispossession.

Making Connections

In focusing on the changing meaning of “community” and “artisan,” my research explored how value and capital accumulation are created closer to the production and consumption of development discourse through particular definitions of shared belonging, authenticity, and shared heritage. This entailed teasing out the overlapping and hierarchical relationships spanning families, co-workers and friends, community hamlets, district, and beyond. It meant expanding our gaze from discrete development projects outward to include several development projects layered on top of earlier experience (Vincent 2012). Seen as processes of development, these various projects interlock and collide with local social dynamics that make up craft commodity networks. As a result, I highlight how tensions arise between cooperation and competition, between personal and collective commitments and loyalties. The

significance of my research is that it provided a more nuanced understanding of how local producers and families actually create and maintain, contest and break from, and attribute meaning to different kinds of social relationships. This understanding offers a counterpoint to current neoliberal discourse for development that promotes a romanticized image of how everyday activities rooted in cultural tradition can be used to mobilize community development.

As I discussed in Chapter 1, the literature on small-scale craft production as a strategy for economic and self-determination assumes that place-based heritages can rework the power relationships in the production system and add value to local products through the marketization of isolated, rural landscapes. As I showed, “culture” defined as a “particular history of local social ties and mutual-responsibility links building trust, including kinship, friendship, and community identity” (Narotzky 2007:405) is ubiquitous in the literature dealing with the “informal economy” of artisan production. Also highlighted in the literature were dispersed productive units located in a shared physical space that were small in scale, but did not preclude innovation and entrepreneurial maneuver. These elements, on the contrary, have been key to “new” forms of organized capitalism particularly adapted to an era of flexible production, one that compelled producers and workers to “naturally” cooperate given their shared identification with a “community” of tradespeople.

Policy-oriented documents also tended to point to particular qualities of social relations that sustained the kinds of productive activities organizing petty capitalism in Latin America. Concepts used to describe them included “social capital,” “reciprocity,” “sharing,” and “shared heritage.” Shared norms and practices of “family,” “neighborliness,” and “community” were identified as providing the “social glue” for maintaining productive relations. At the same time, they were structured by a division of labor seemingly based on the harmony of roles for all

people working in the industry. Chief among them have been “entrepreneurial” artisans characterized in policy by the ability of certain individuals within the community to forge and sustain social relationships with individuals and institutions outside the community. Autonomy enables some economics agents in a community to overcome the centripetal forces and closure that are generally attributed to social and cultural proximity. Once again, local practices of survival and livelihood get made and remade as “tools” for intentional development.

My research, however, endeavored to reveal how such concepts obscured what actual social relationships structuring production are like. As Narotzky similarly argued for the Western European context, these “concepts they were associated with transmitted a positive moral atmosphere or feeling about a range of differentiated actions and transactions and their conscious interpretations by social actors” (2007:405). This dissertation thus contributes to studies that incorporate forms of social and economic differentiation into the current model for development.

In Chapter 2, I showed how particular processes of commoditization and capital accumulation are mutually shaping and related to the construction of certain social fields, particularly at the local level. Place, tradition, and identities (local and regional) have historically been reconfigured by dominant social groups (e.g., Spanish colonialists, state administrations, intellectuals, development agents, and even producers themselves) in order to create cultural differences. These, in turn, have become part of the political economic differentiation shaping social relationships in rural Peru.

I show that we cannot understand transformations in craft production without understanding a broad range of economic and social transformations in the history of Peruvian capitalism – the arrival of the Spanish in the 16th century and the creation of more diversified

working population in rural areas; the development of regional and national markets and modes of circulation; the revolution of craft production, processing, and distribution that resulted in the creation of tourist and ethnic art markets, among other things; the evolution of development policies that have reinforced craftwork as central to national identity, slowing rural-to-urban migration, and boosting the national economy in world markets; and so on. In all this, the particular history of the standardization of craftwork for mass markets is not unrelated to the history of standardization, indeed “industrialization,” of other kinds of products in general in the 20th and 21st century. My work in this chapter builds on the work of David Harvey, who saw the regime of “flexible accumulation” emerge in partial response to the perceived rigidities of the “Fordist” regime of accumulation and financial crises of the 1970s. His description of the innovations characteristic of flexible accumulation concentrates on many features that we have already encountered in my discussion of small-scale craftwork – the identification of cultural market niches and the production of goods for those niches as opposed to the emphasis on mass-market standardized products; the focus on small-scale production operations; the reconfiguration of these production units to resemble local cooperative structures that more effectively compete in global craft markets; and so on.

Development policies and wider political economic processes wrapped up in the uneven development of capitalist logics have thus been providing crucial conditions giving direction to the practices and relations I saw in the field in contemporary Quinoa, Peru. Ultimately, these particular processes of accumulation have contributed to the creation of particular kinds of artisan producers as well as particular configurations of workplace and community, all of which are central to current neoliberal policies that have reframed how people go about building livelihoods as innovative strategies for development.

The chapter ended with showing the complex relation between the recent rise of “ethnic” art and artifacts and an earlier period of characterized by standardization and mass marketing. I also dealt with how this historical issue further articulated with specific kinds of development policies surrounding petty capitalist producers, shared traditions, and community identity. These layers of historical processes are key to understanding how producers and their social relationships are embedded in processes and relations of capital accumulation of wider scope.

Chapters 3 and 4 offer specific instances of how these policies, and their attendant neglect of how social relationships are actually created and maintained, disrupted and fought over, have interacted with actual and dynamics social structures on the ground. In this dissertation, I thus examined how the top-down structures of business associations and IPRs intersect with local social dynamics among Quinoa potters. I argued that there is a tension between cooperation and competition, between the collective good and personal gain, that defines individual and community engagement with such new state development plans. Recognizing how the personal and professional are intertwined, I showed that traditional bonds of social obligation constrain the sort of economic growth individual producers experience, and that the most successful producers are those who are able to channel traditional reciprocal ties into business productivity.

Chapter 3, dealt with development projects to organize artisans into business associations and how assuming a particular kind of “community” of tradespeople overlooks the complexity of social relations, involving tensions between the negative, corrosive and the more caring, supportive features of social life. The issue with these policies then is that by conceiving all sorts of social relations in market terms they seeks to render them productive and profitable. They also obscure the more oppressive aspects of these social relations, whether they are built on

friendship, community belonging, or commodity production.

Based on my ethnographic research, the recent history of business association projects in Quinua reveals the considerable influence that the personal and political loyalties and social networks of individual producers – with government and program officials – have had on selection of leaders. These networks are not autonomous or accidental – they reflect previous forms and moments of promotion of artisan craftwork and the broad political economic principles that governed them at the time. While these do not determine actors' network, or how they later use them, they do structure them. I argued that the forms taken by aid flows and the business associations through which they are channeled have much to do with the structure of underlying social and institutional relationships. In these cases, longstanding partnerships between prominent artisan families and government agencies, NGOs, and other development institutions shaped the nature of associations. In the process of network building, personal contacts are vital – particularly so when they are embedded in deeper institutional commitments. Yet, producers' personal contacts are not accidental, and have a great deal to do with institutions, social networks, histories and political economic contexts within which they are embedded.

This raised the question of how to understand the role of human agency in driving the forms taken by these chains of social relationships. Thus, while ethnographic cases in the previous chapters suggest considerable limits on the scope for agency of certain producers (particularly artisan-peasants), I also showed how local dynamics can subvert the intentions of these programs while simultaneously reinforcing the models on which they structured.

In Chapter 4, I analyzed how work is an activity made meaningful by combinations of time and identity invested in it by workers. The disruption caused by precariousness of artisan work can as much – even more – about loss of the structure of production and/or of the sense of

self as it is about the crude realities of money. This chapter examined the cultural and moral context of artisans' tactics of appropriation in Quinua. In certain contexts, artisans shared, borrowed, reused, and even stole stylistic and technical elements from others. I was not necessarily interested in similarities and differences between ceramic objects themselves, or in whether these constitute "authentic" manifestations of a cultural heritage of ceramic making in the Quinua area. Rather, I highlighted the relationships between artisans as they debate and negotiate material practices of and meanings of aesthetic appropriation. What made these relationships particularly tense lies in how artisans differently, and sometimes contradictorily, interpret their and others' practices of appropriation: appropriation may be a way of maintaining a community's craft tradition, a livelihood strategy, a socially offensive act, a sign of unoriginality, or even a creative technique. Within this context, I focused on narratives artisans tell themselves and others about who they are, and are not, as artisans, and thereby made claims about and debated who counts and who does not as an artisan.

This chapter showed that authenticity may look very different from how it is conceived by policymakers and development specialists. By considering how different people value and prioritize in terms of their own understandings of "true artisan," I offered an analysis of how personal dimensions of authenticity might contrast and potentially compete with collective ones. In particular, these include individual and family reputation, moral standards for developing a personal style, and shared repertoire of designs and motifs. I tried to show how collaboration coexists with conflicts and moral commitments, influencing people's decisions regarding their aesthetic strategies.

Contributions

This dissertation closes by drawing out implications for anthropological research on livelihoods and strategies of survival, as well as efforts to theorize the relationships between intentional development interventions and immanent processes of political economic change, and their effects on inequality and unevenness of development interventions. I developed symbolic narrative in contrast to the discourse of dominant discourses that divide up society, and it may challenge dichotomies such as productive/nonproductive, deserving/undeserving. I consider production in various spheres to show that allocation of resources (material, social, and cultural) are both politically conditioned and socially embedded in multiple and complex social relations.

I see few *in situ* options for the poorer sectors of the rural population under the context of contemporary capitalist development. Those peasant-artisan households deemed unviable, due to their reliance on agricultural subsistence, include some of the poorest of the poor. The very poorest are particularly at disadvantage, and often confined to more rural spaces. They have severely constrained opportunities to develop other, less agrarian livelihoods, like artisan enterprises. The other, not quite so poor households who have acquired somewhat more human, financial, and educational capital have been better able to respond to the constraints on the viability of their agricultural base. They were specifically capable of building spatially complex and mobile strategies, ranging from the combination of artisan and farm activities to periodic participation in development projects. These livelihoods based on complex and shifting social connections are themselves responses to the unevenness of development (see also Bebbington 2004). They reflect people's efforts to move between and, through their own livelihoods, articulate with intentional development projects as well as wide-ranging markets, shifting

between the economically powerful centers and peripheries of their own and other societies.

Instead, people's understanding of "community" and social relationships must be problematized, and problematized in a quite specific way: subjectivities are understood within the frame of the historical development of quite specific kinds of relationships. My work speaks to two groups of communal anthropology. As Gavin Smith (1999) says:

Once we understand institutions in terms of social reproduction, we are able to see them less in terms of things and more in terms of forces, or at least in terms of a geography of society in which we understand institutions as bridgeheads of power – facilitating certain practices, often by means of 'order' and regulation, and, just as surely, preventing other practices, closing certain social spaces, and inducing disorder and deregulation. (11)

Thompson (1968) further suggests that when we encounter powerful phrases like "social entrepreneur" or "socio-territorial entity where community and firms tend to merge"/ "social capital, reflected in local civic traditions and community norms, is said to facilitate co-operative behavior" / "a social solidarity built upon affective ties as part of a common kinship group or community identity," we must be on alert. For behind this community-like superior interest there is a structure of social relations, fostering some kinds of appropriation of value (rent, profit) and outlawing others (theft), legitimizing some types of conflict (competition, risk, divergence of interest or outlook among association partners that do not get in the way of managing the business association) and inhibiting others (popular political organization).

In contrast to those who see development as discrete projects that "fail," I have tried in this dissertation to transcend these more conventional "images" of intervention that are limited to discrete projects and isolated from evolving social relations between social actors, including state institutions and officials (Long 2001). I have taken every-day talk and sentiments, such as accusations of envy, corruption, and selfishness, and placed them within such an analytical framework along with official documents and larger historical processes. I have approached

these data as factors shaping the “experiential meaning-creating process” in which artisan workers employ aspects of dominant cultural representations, like “creativity”, to criticize their own world as well as their situation of partial domination.

My focus on evaluations and disagreements between artisan producers emerged from constant reiteration, effects, and presence of struggles over development aid. However, my concentration on conflicts does not mean that every element of social relationships in Quinua involve heated arguments. Thus, although I show the centrality of conflict to Quinua, I do not aim to portray potters as essentialized others, constantly driven by an all-encompassing field of envy, corruption, and deceit. Additionally, my analytical focus on conflict should not prejudice readers to see Quinua potters as some kind of pathological subject, or as morally flawed human beings, as was often the case in some accounts of conflict offered by development workers. On the contrary, I aimed to debunk such moralizing portrayals of selfish beings in the world, especially since the yardstick for such evaluations are capitalist-based and methodological individualistic driven models. As much as conflict can at times be seen in negative terms by potters (or the anthropologist, development worker, or government official), it is also related to a range of other social and moral ties, securing a sense of belonging and establishing a particular relationship between the self, the world, and others.

In this final section, I want to try to get beyond these self- and collectively-defeating discourses, to push further the question of how a society might improve its economic standard of living with social and political consequences that the members of that society find acceptable. Current development policy stresses “agency,” the individual autonomy of self-actualization. From this perspective, traditional neoliberal frameworks (for example, cutting of public social services and privatization of land) have given way to “entrepreneurial” and “competitive”

individuals who construct his or her own identity through market choices employing their social and cultural assets. I conducted my own research following at least a decade of criticism of the “social capital” concept as it is used in development policy (e.g., Cleaver 2005). This scholarship has now made it clear that “social capital” has allowed for the accommodation of social relations and cultural values into the otherwise abstracted modeling of mainstream neoliberal economics. The neoliberal models of business associations (bringing entrepreneurship to cooperative organizations) as tools of development in rural Peru seek to harness grassroots cultural energy. Similarly, IPRs have been enacted to protect local artisanal traditions. Yet, these models are based on an idealized abstraction of community organization that often does not mesh with on the ground realities. The focus on entrepreneurship coupled with concepts of “social capital” and “community,” seemingly accounts for power differences without proper consideration of the negative aspects of social life or the structural constraints for the poorest.

Such an approach ignores the fact that people who confront, use and respond to social relationships and their meanings do so in terms of the material, social and cultural constraints of their own personal situations. The ways in which people respond to and use meanings have material, social and cultural consequences for themselves and for those meanings. However, where prevailing ideology tends to consider social and family considerations as subservient to economic factors, scholars and development practitioners must also lay stress on the tensions that arise as the former are put to work for the latter (Narotzky 2008).

The “deserving” and “undeserving”: moral communities of workers

What I believe to be powerful about the case of producers in Quinoa has to do with what many would refer to as the kinds of “resistances” they have put up against more politically and

economically powerful individuals, organizations, and wider forces. As if testifying to the nature of a more or less diffuse power force taken by individual producers and families, development agents and government officials speak of these forces and do so in terms of “resistance.”

Many scholars, including anthropologists, have argued that these diverse cultural logics and practices in which social actors engage, consciously or unconsciously, “resist” the logic of self-interested accumulation of value and market logics.⁸⁷ My detailed case study of the changing social relationships of Peruvian artisan producers emphasizes the constraining as well as the enabling nature of close social ties, and in particular the conflictual nature of close family relationships, a point echoed by the work of other scholars (Koda 2000; Long 2001).

Additionally, it illustrates how relations with kin and close neighbors are particularly likely to be fraught with concerns about authenticity. This aligns with evidence from scholars who show how similarly close relationships are fraught with concerns about witchcraft (Cleaver 2000).

My concern here, though, is that policy documents and projects for development now draw on this discourse of “local resistance,” arguing that local economic actors are resistant to change. “Change” in this sphere of dominant practices of development is defined as educating, if not pressuring, people to adopt attitudes and values of capitalist accumulation, even in terms of

⁸⁷ In addressing different notions of what constitutes livelihood and prosperity, previous studies in anthropology (Gudeman and Rivera 1990, 1993) observed that the logic of peasant production in the Andes has been significantly different from that of capitalist production, leading to the coexistence of two distinct economies. But this should not lead to the conclusion that under certain conditions peasants are uninterested in generating surpluses or improving production technologies⁸⁷ (Escobar 1995) Mayer (2002), for instance, suggests that peasants in Tangor, Peru understand profits and losses of cash crops in terms of a simple cash-out and cash-in flow, ignoring household inputs and family labor. In peasant accounting practices, “profit” defined as a strict business accounting procedure is not a relevant category. Mayer shows that there are fundamental differences between the ways in which businesses pursue profits and the ways in which peasant households operate. But this distinction, as Mayer contends, should not obscure the fact that peasant farmers pursue gains wherever they can. Profitability, rather than having a universal (capitalist) meaning, must be defined by analysts of peasant economies in terms of the cultural matrix in which it functions. Mayer’s work points us toward understanding how economies are shaped by the search for livelihood and household reproduction and are thus not ruled by the laws of calculation of the market system. We are encouraged to develop a wider frame of reference to which the market itself might be referred, particularly that advocated under neoliberal paradigms.

the social relationships people seek to establish and maintain.

At the local level, producers in Quinoa are echoing these concerns, recognizing problems between artisans that prevent them from using development assistance as it was designed to be used and, thus get the financial returns from such “appropriate” use. “We don’t really learn, do we Yeni,” an artisan once told me in a conversation about why he thought associations did not work for him. A development worker, a regional government official, and a ceramic specialist at the university in Ayacucho, all of whom have worked with artisans in Quinoa for extended periods, described on separate instances artisans in Quinoa as *divididos* and *egoístas*, explaining that they do not know how to value themselves and each other, their work, or the development assistance they have received throughout the last decade. While such explanations may serve as the starting point for asking *how* and *why* substantive economic transformation is slow to emerge, they tend to reinforce feelings of self- and communal-criticism in the local social setting, giving space to pathology for “failed” development projects. Such blame works to constrain local people’s sense of capacity for building livelihoods that have meaning and sustain social reproduction.

Rather than resistance, however, I believe underlying these acts are moments of negotiation, personally and collectively engaged, of the terms of their involvement in and meanings of multiple collective undertakings. Other comments bear on the disintegration of community life stemming from the intrusion of an external world of development agents perceived as dangerous. Local producers, as artisans, peasants, or otherwise, are committed to the differences between them and simultaneously to the on-going construction of an image of themselves as belonging to a shared “something” (G. Smith 1999). They argue with themselves, not just about the use of development monies and stolen properties, but about the institutions and

practices that are foundational to their wellbeing. These include “family,” “community,” “the village,” and “our reality” or “our way of life.” What I believe we have seen in the preceding case is what Gavin Smith pointed out for peasants in Huasicancha, Peru, that is, “the heightened political struggle intensifies discourses within, bringing to the forefront of people’s minds their most vital preoccupations, precisely because it tugs urgently at their sleeves, impelling them to articulate just what those preoccupations should be” (1999:56). Each producer was fighting for their way of life, which occasioned certain manifestations of the very features constituting the way of life. Because different families and producers required different elements of that “way of life” for their reproduction, what is essential and what is less so were diverse, though not without emerging as patterned.

The case of Quinoa producers also illustrates the overwhelming importance of relationships that are not based on turning a cash profit to the livelihoods of the least economically secure people. Indeed, Roberto too combines his ability to draw on social relations in the community, beyond artisan production, to further his livelihood even as he seeks a level of security for his family in ceramic production. Still, the detailed material I have for these producers demonstrate that their circles of affiliation become more constrained as they move away from family, neighbors and friends in their community hamlets. For them, “investing” in the collective action projects of associations with immediate and very real costs, and diffuse, long-term benefits, is a far less accessible livelihood strategy (see also Cleaver 2005).

“The individual actor,” the sociologist Norman Long states, “has the capacity to process social experience and to devise ways of coping with life, even under the most extreme forms of coercion... that agency is about the ability to choose levels of ‘enrollment’ in the projects of others and to exert influence for enrolling others in one’s own project” (Long and Long

1992:22). Indeed, people of various degrees of economic disadvantage in Quinoa are capable of exercising agency, of influencing the influential, and for constructing purpose and meaning in social relationships (Cleaver 2005). However, I have suggested here that these potential capacities are routinely frustrated by the workings of multi-scalar inequities and the development apparatuses through which norms and values are channeled. Too, there is a danger in assuming that people can use social connections to move out of disadvantaged positions, which can lead to a situation where people are blamed for their own deficit of social connections, for not caring for others or their community, and for their marginalization.

So, reconsidering how people differently use and construct social networks for production and marketing is relevant for understanding increasing inequality and differentiation. This has allowed me to critically examine how social relationships enable or constrain livelihoods of the people I worked with in Peru, and what “room for maneuver” they have within diverse, existing social structures. It also facilitates our understandings of processes of inclusion and exclusion, and the limits to the emancipatory possibilities of development interventions aimed at promoting public engagement and cultural representation.

REFERENCES

- Acha, Juan. 1979. *Arte y sociedad, Latinoamérica: sistema de producción*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Agrawal, Arjun, and Clark C. Gibson. 2001. *Communities and the environment: Ethnicity, gender and the state in community-based conservation*. Rutgers University Press.
- Alberti, Giorgio, and Enrique Mayer. 1974. *Reciprocidad e intercambio en los Andes peruanos*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Altenburg, Tilman, and Jörg Meyer-Stamer. 1999. How to Promote Clusters: Policy Experiences from Latin America. *World Development* 27(9):1693-1713.
- Amin, Ash, and Nigel Thrift. 1992. Neo-Marshallian Nodes in Global Networks. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 16(4):571-587.
- ANDINA. 2013a. Peru's handicraft exports totaled US\$69.9mln in 2012. *In* ANDINA. Lima, Peru: ANDINA, agencia peruana de noticias.
- . 2013b. Peru's handicraft sector to rise between 6-7% in 2013. *In* ANDINA. Lima, Peru: ANDINA, agencia peruana de noticias.
- Andolina, Robert, Nina Laurie, and Sarah A. Radcliffe. 2009. *Indigenous development in the Andes: culture, power, and transnationalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (pp. 3-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1996. *Modernity at large: cultural dimensions of globalization, Public worlds*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arce, Alberto, and Norman Long. 2000. *Anthropology, development, and modernities : exploring discourses, counter-tendencies, and violence*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Arce, Moisés. 2006. The Societal Consequences of Market Reform in Peru. *Latin American Politics and Society* 48(1):27-54.
- Arguedas, José María, Alejandro Ortiz Rescaniere, and Carmen María Pinilla. 1966. José María Arguedas: Mejía Baca.
- Arguedas, José María. 1958. Notas elementales sobre el arte popular religioso y la cultura mestiza de Huamanga. *Revista del Museo Nacional* 28:140-194.
- Arnold, Dean E. 1972a. Mineralogical analyses of ceramic materials from Quinua, Department of Ayacucho, Peru. *Archaeometry* 67:858-872.
- . 1972b. Native pottery making in Quinua, Peru. *Anthropos* 67:858-872.
- . 1975. Ceramic ecology in the Ayacucho Basin, Peru: implications for prehistory. *Current Anthropology* 16(2):183-203.
- . 1985. *Ceramic Theory and Cultural Process*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- . 1993. *Ecology and ceramic production in an Andean community. New studies in archaeology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. Mikhail Mikhailovich. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Banfield, Edward C. 1967. "The moral basis of a backward society."
- Barkin, David. 1990. *Distorted development: Mexico in the world economy*: Westview Press.
- . 2001. "Neoliberalism and sustainable popular development." In *Transcending Neoliberalism: Community-Based Development in Latin America*. Henry Veltmeyer and Anthony O'Malley, eds. 184-204. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Bartra, Roger. 1993. *Agrarian structure and political power in Mexico*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Basadre, Jorge. 1929. La iniciación de la república: contribución al estudio de la evolución política y social del Perú. Volume 1: F. y E. Rosay.
- Bebbington, Anthony. 1996. "Organizations and intensifications: campesino federations, rural livelihoods and agricultural technology in the Andes and Amazonia." *World Development* 24 (7):1161-1177.
- . 1999. "Capitals and capabilities: a framework for analyzing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty." *World development* no. 27 (12):2021-2044.
- . 2000. Reencountering Development: Livelihood Transitions and Place Transformations in the Andes. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90(3):495-520.
- Becattini, Giacomo. 1990. "The Marshallian industrial district as a socio-economic notion." *Industrial districts and inter-firm co-operation in Italy*:37-51.
- Becker, Howard Saul. 1982. *Art worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Blanchard, Peter. 1982. *The Origins of the Peruvian Labor Movement, 1883–1919*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice* translated by R. Nice: Cambridge.
- . 1986. The forms of capital. In *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. J.G. Richardson, ed. Pp. 241-258. New York: Greenwood.
- Bromley, Ray. 1990. A new path to development? The significance and impact of Hernando De Soto's ideas on underdevelopment, production, and reproduction. *Economic Geography* 66(4):328-348.
- Brosius, J. Peter, Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing, and Charles Zerner. 1998. "Representing communities: Histories and politics of community-based natural resource management."
- Brosius, J. Peter. 1997. "Prior transcripts, divergent paths: Resistance and acquiescence to logging in Sarawak, East Malaysia." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* no. 39 (3):468-510.
- Brown, Michael F. 2003. *Who owns native culture?* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, Wendy. 2003. "Neo-liberalism and the end of liberal democracy." *Theory & Event* no. 7 (1).

- Burdick, John, Philip Oxhorn, and Kenneth M. Roberts. 2009. *Beyond neoliberalism in Latin America?: societies and politics at the crossroads*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burdick, John. 1995. "Uniting theory and practice in the ethnography of social movements: Notes toward a hopeful realism." *Dialectical Anthropology* no. 20 (3):361-385.
- Calabrese, Andrew. 1991. "The periphery in the center: The information age and the 'good life' in rural America." *International Communication Gazette* no. 48 (2):105-128.
- Canclini, Néstor García. 1993. *Transforming modernity: Popular culture in Mexico*. Austin: U of Texas Press.
- CARE Perú. 2007. *La Experiencia de Constitución del Centro de Competitividad de Ayacucho*. Lima, Perú: CARE Perú
- Carroll, Thomas F., and Anthony J. Bebbington. 2000. "Peasant federations and rural development policies in the Andes." *Policy Sciences* no. 33 (3-4):435-457.
- Castrillón Vizcarra, Alfonso. 2003. Mendizábal Losack y sus estudios sobre arte popular andino. In *Del Sanmarkos al retablo ayacuchano : dos ensayos pioneros sobre arte tradicional peruano*. E. Mendizábal Losack ed. Pp. 15-17. Lima, Peru: Universidad Ricardo Palma, Instituto Cultural Peruano Norteamericano.
- Chan, Anita S. 2011. Competitive Tradition: Intellectual Property and New Millennial Craft. *Anthropology of Work Review* 32:90-102.
- Chase, Jacquelyn. 2002. *The spaces of neoliberalism: land, place and family in Latin America*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Chibnik, Michael. 2003. *Crafting tradition: The making and marketing of Oaxacan wood carvings*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- CIAP. 2004. *Ley del Artesano*: CIAP: Artesanía y comercio justo en Perú.
- Cleaver, Frances. 2000. "Moral ecological rationality, institutions and the management of common property resources." *Development and change* no. 31 (2):361-383.
- . 2005. "The inequality of social capital and the reproduction of chronic poverty." *World Development* no. 33 (6):893-906.
- Cohen, Anthony P. 1985. *Symbolic construction of community*: Ellis Horwood Ltd and Tavistock Publications Ltd.
- Cohen, Jeffrey and Anjali Browning. 2007. The Decline of a Craft: Basket Making in San Juan Guelavia, Oaxaca. *Human Organization* 66(3):299-339.
- Cohen, Jeffrey H. 1998. "Craft production and the challenge of the global market: An artisans' cooperative in Oaxaca, Mexico." *Human Organization* no. 57 (1):74-82.
- . 1999. *Cooperation and community: economy and society in Oaxaca*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- . 2001. Textile, tourism and community development. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(2):378-398.
- Collier, John. 1949. *The Awakening Valley*. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.
- Collins, Jane L. 2009. *Threads: Gender, labor, and power in the global apparel industry*: University of Chicago Press.

- Colloredo-Mansfeld, Rudi. 1999. *The native leisure class: consumption and cultural creativity in the Andes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2002. An Ethnography of Neoliberalism: Understanding Competition in Artisan Economies. *Current Anthropology* 43(1):113-137.
- . 2009. *Fighting like a community: Andean civil society in an era of Indian uprisings*: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2011. Work, Cultural Resources, and Community Commodities in the Global Economy. *Anthropology of Work Review* 32(2):51-62.
- Colloredo-Mansfeld, Rudi, and Jason Antrosio. 2009. Economic Clusters or Cultural Commons?: The Limits of Competition-Driven Limits of Development in the Ecuadorian Andes. *Latin American Research Review* 44(1):132-57.
- Comaroff, Jean, and John L. Comaroff. 2001. "On personhood: an anthropological perspective from Africa." *Social Identities* no. 7 (2):267-283.
- . 2005. "Millennial capitalism and the culture of neoliberalism." In *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization: From Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism*, edited by Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud, 177-187. Wiley-Blackwell.
- . 2009. *Ethnicity*, Inc. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cook, Anita G., and Nancy L. Benco. 2012. "Vasijas para la fiesta y la fama: producción artesanal en un centro urbano huari." *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* (4):489-504.
- Cook, Scott, and Leigh Binford. 1990. *Obliging need: rural petty industry in Mexican capitalism*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1981. Crafts, capitalist development, and cultural property in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Inter-American Economic Affairs* 35(3):53-68.
- . 1984. "Peasant economy, rural industry and capitalist development in the Oaxaca Valley, Mexico." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* no. 12 (1):3-40.
- . 1993. "Craft commodity production, market diversity, and differential rewards in Mexican capitalism today." *Crafts in the world market*:59-83.
- Coombe, Rosemary J, Steven Schnoor, and Mohsen Ahmed. 2006. *Bearing Cultural Distinction: Informational Capitalism and New Expectations for Intellectual Property*. UC Davis L.
- Coombe, Rosemary J. 1998. *The cultural life of intellectual properties: Authorship, appropriation, and the law*: Duke University Press.
- . 2005. Legal Claims to Culture in and Against the Market: Neoliberalism and the Global Proliferation of Meaningful Difference. *Law, Culture and the Humanities* 1(1):35-52.
- . 2009. "The expanding purview of cultural properties and their politics." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 5:393-412.
- . 2011. "Possessing Culture." In *Ownership and Appropriation*, edited by Veronica Strang and Mark Busse, 105-129. New York: Berg.
- Cotler, Julio. 1994. *Política y Sociedad en el Perú*. Volume 23: IEP.
- Creed, Gerald W. 2000. "'Family Values' and Domestic Economies." *Annual Review of*

- Anthropology* (29):329-355.
- Creed, Gerald W., ed. 2006. *The seductions of community: Emancipations, oppressions, quandaries*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Dasgupta, Partha, and Ismail Serageldin. 2000. Social capital: a multifaceted perspective. Pp. 1 online resource xii, 424 p. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Davis, Shelton, and William Partridge. 1994. Promoting the Development of Indigenous Peoples in Latin America. *Finance and Development* 38-40.
- Davis, Shelton. 2002. "Indigenous peoples, poverty and participatory development: The experience of the World Bank in Latin America." In *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous rights, diversity and democracy*, edited by Rachel Sieder, 227-251. London: Palgrave.
- De Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: U of California P.
- De la Cadena, Marisol. 2000. *Indigenous Mestizos: the politics of race and culture in Cuzco, Peru, 1919-1991*. Duke University Press.
- De Soto, Hernando. 1989. *The other path*: Harper & Row New York.
- . 2000. The mystery of capital: Why capitalism succeeds in the West and fails everywhere else. New York: Basic Books.
- . 2002. *The other path: The economic answer to terrorism*: Basic Books.
- Degregori, Carlos Iván. 1998. Harvesting storms: Peasant rondas and the defeat of Sendero Luminoso in Ayacucho. In *Shining and other paths: War and society in Peru*. S.J. Stern, ed. Pp. 128-157.
- DeHart, Monica C. 2010. Ethnic entrepreneurs : identity and development politics in Latin America. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Diéguez, José Sabogal. 1975. *Del arte en el Perú y otros ensayos*: Instituto Nacional de Cultura.
- Dirven, Martine. 2000. "Dairy clusters in Latin America in the context of globalization." *The International Food and Agribusiness Management Review* no. 2 (3):301-313.
- Eber, Christine, and Brenda Rosenbaum. 1993. "'That we may serve beneath your hands and feet': Women weavers in highland Chiapas, Mexico." In *Crafts in the World Market: the impact of global exchange on Middle American artisans*, edited by June Nash, 182. Albany: SUNY.
- Eber, Christine, and Christine Kovic. 2003. *Women in Chiapas*: Routledge.
- Ebersole, Robert P. 1968. La artesanía del sur del Perú. Volume 9: Instituto Indigenista Interamericano México.
- Ehlers, Tracy. 1982. "The Decline of Female Family Business: A Guatemalan Case Study." *Women and Politics* no. 7:7-21.
- . 1993. "Belts, business, and Bloomingdale's: an alternative model for Guatemalan artisan development." *Crafts in the world market: The impact of global exchange on Middle American artisans*:181-98.
- . 2000. *Silent looms: Women and production in a Guatemalan town*: U of Texas Press.
- Elyachar, Julia. 2005. *Markets of Dispossession: NGOs, Economic Development, and the State*

- in Cairo*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering development: the making and unmaking of the third world*. Princeton studies in culture/power/history. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Femenías, Blenda. 2005. *Gender and the boundaries of dress in contemporary Peru*: U of Texas Press.
- Fischer, Edward F., and Peter Blair Benson. 2006. *Broccoli and desire: Global connections and Maya struggles in postwar Guatemala*: Stanford University Press.
- Fox, Richard G. 1999 Culture—A Second Chance? *Current Anthropology* 40.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. 1966. *The development of underdevelopment*: New England Free Press.
- Fromhold-Eisebith, Martina. 2004 Innovative milieu and social capital: complementary or redundant concepts of collaboration-based regional development?—*European Planning Studies* 12(6):747-765.
- García Canclini, Néstor. 1982. Las culturas populares en el capitalismo. Mexico: Nueva Imagen.
- . 1993. *Transforming modernity: popular culture in Mexico*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Garofoli, Gioacchino. 1991. The Italian model of spatial development in the 1970s and 1980s. *In* Industrial change and regional development: The transformation of new industrial spaces. G. Benko and M. Dunford, eds. Pp. 85-101. London: Belhaven.
- Gee, J. P. 1999. *An introduction to discourse analysis theory and method*. New York: Routledge.
- Gell, Alfred. 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gibson-Graham, J-K. 1996. *The end of capitalism (as we knew it): A feminist critique of political economy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- . 2005. Surplus Possibilities: Postdevelopment and Community Economies. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 26(1):4-26.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1979. *Central problems in social theory: action, structure and contradictions in social analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1984. *The constitution of society: introduction of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gilbert, Alan. 2002. "On the mystery of capital and the myths of Hernando de Soto: What difference does legal title make?" *International Development Planning Review* no. 24 (1):1-19.
- Gill, Lesley. 2000. Teetering on the rim: global restructuring, daily life, and the armed retreat of the Bolivian state. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Giuliani, Elisa, Carlo Pietrobelli, and Roberta Rabellotti. 2005. Upgrading in Global Value Chains: Lessons from Latin American Clusters. *World Development* 33(4):549-573.
- Gledhill, John. 2009. "The Rights of the Rich Versus the Rights of the Poor." *In Rights-based Approaches to Development: Exploring the Potential and Pitfalls*, edited by Samuel Hickey and Diana Mitlin, 31-48. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York.

- Goldstein, Daniel M. 2004. *The spectacular city: violence and performance in urban Bolivia*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Gölte, Jürgen. 1992. "Los Problemas con las Comunidades." *Debate Agrario* no. 14:18-22.
- Gonzales de Olarte, Efraín. 1998. *El neoliberalismo a la peruana: economía política del ajuste estructural, 1990-1997*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos y Consorcio de Investigación Económica.
- González de la Rocha, Mercedes , and Agustín Escobar Latapí. 2002. "The Restructuring of Labor Markets, International Migration, and Household Economies in Urban Mexico " In *The Spaces of Neoliberalism: Land, Place and Family in Latin America*, edited by Jacquelyn Chase. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Gootenberg, Paul. 1993. *Imagining development*: University of California Press.
- Gowlland, Geoffrey. (2009). Style, Skill and Modernity in the Zisha Pottery of China. *Journal of Modern Craft*, 2(2), 129-141.
- Graburn, Nelson H. H. 1976. *Ethnic and tourist arts: Cultural expressions from the fourth world*: Univ of California Press.
- Grimes, Kimberly M. 2000. *Artisans and cooperatives: Developing alternate trade for the global economy*: University of Arizona Press.
- Gudeman, Stephen, and Alberto Rivera-Gutiérrez. 2002. "Neither Duck nor Rabbit: Sustainability, Political Economy, and the Dialectics of Economy." In *The Spaces of Neoliberalism: Land, Place and Family in Latin America*, 159-86. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Gudeman, Stephen. 1996. "Sketches, Qualms, and Other Thoughts on Intellectual Property Rights." In *Valuing Local Knowledge*, 102-21. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- . 2008. *Economy's tension : the dialectics of community and market*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- . 2008. *Economy's Tension: the Dialectics of Community and Market*: Berghahn Books.
- Gwynne, Robert N., and Cristóbal Kay, eds. 1999. *Latin America transformed: globalization and modernity*: Arnold London.
- Hadjimichalis, Costis. 2006a. The End of Third Italy As We Knew It? *Antipode* 38(1):82-106.
- . 2006b. Non-Economic Factors in Economic Geography and in 'New Regionalism': A Sympathetic Critique. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30(3):690-704.
- Hale, Charles R. 2002. Does multiculturalism menace? Governance, cultural rights and the politics of identity in Guatemala. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34(3):485-524.
- . 2005. "Neoliberal Multiculturalism." *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* no. 28 (1):10-19.
- . 2006. *Más que un Indio (More than an Indian): racial ambivalence and neoliberal multiculturalism in Guatemala*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Hartley, John. 1982. *Understanding news*: Methuen London.

- Harvey, David. 1989. *The condition of postmodernity: an enquiry into the origins of cultural change*.
- . 2000. *Spaces of hope*. 1 vols. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- . 2006. *Spaces of global capitalism*. New York: Verso.
- . 2007. "Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* no. 610 (1):21-44.
- Healy, Kevin. 2001. *Llamas, weavings, and organic chocolate: multicultural grassroots development in the Andes and Amazon of Bolivia*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Heraclio, Bonilla, and Karen Spalding. 1972. "La Independencia del Perú, las palabras y los hechos." *Lima, IEP*.
- Hernando, Nelly, and Sandra Van Hulsen. 2001. *Investigación del cluster de Artesanía en Ayacucho; sus características y potencial de desarrollo (Investigation of the handicraft cluster in Ayacucho: its characteristics and development potential)*. Lima: ILO.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 2004. *The body impolitic: artisans and artifice in the global hierarchy of value*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hollis, Aidan. 2003. Industrial Concentration, Output, and Trade: An Empirical Exploration. *Review of Industrial Organization* 22(2):103-119.
- Humphrey, John, and Hubert Schmitz. 1998. Trust and inter-firm relations in developing and transition economies. *Journal of Development Studies* 34(4):32-61.
- Hyland, Stanley, ed. 2005. *Community building in the twenty-first century*. Santa Fe: School for American Research Press.
- Indacochea, Alejandro. 2001. *Ayacucho Competitivo*. Lima: CARE-Peru/USAID.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática. 2007. *XI Censo de Población y VI de Vivienda (Eleventh Population and Sixth Household Census)*. edited by Sistemas Nacionales de Estadística e Informática en el Perú. Lima, Peru: INEI.
- . 2009. *Evolución de la Pobreza al 2009*. edited by Sistemas Nacionales de Estadística e Informática en el Perú. Lima, Peru: INEI.
- Inter-American Development Bank. 2006. *Gestión efectiva de emprendimientos sociales: Lecciones extraídas de empresas y organizaciones de la sociedad civil en Iberoamérica*: IDB.
- Jackson, Jean E., and Kay B. Warren. 2005. "Indigenous movements in Latin America, 1992-2004: controversies, ironies, new directions." *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* no. 34:549-573.
- Johnstone, Barbara. 2002. *Discourse analysis. Introducing Linguistics*. London: Blackwell.
- Joseph, Miranda. 2002. *Against the romance of community*: U of Minnesota Press.
- Keane, Webb. 1997. *Signs of recognition : powers and hazards of representation in an Indonesian society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2007. *Christian moderns: freedom and fetish in the mission encounter*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kearney, Michael. 1995. "The local and the global: The anthropology of globalization and

- transnationalism." *Annual review of anthropology*:547-565.
- . 1996. *Reconceptualizing the peasantry: anthropology in global perspective*: Westview Press, Inc.
- Kleymeyer, Charles D. 1994. *Cultural expression and grassroots development: cases from Latin America and the Caribbean*: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Kopytoff, Igor. 1986. The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (pp. 64-91). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Korovkin, Tanya. 1997. Taming Capitalism: The Evolution of the Indigenous Peasant Economy in Northern Ecuador. *Latin American Research Review* 32(3):89-110.
- . 1998. Commodity Production and Ethnic Culture: Otavalo, Northern Ecuador. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 47:125-154.
- Kroeber, AL, and Clyde Kluckhohn. 1963. Culture: a critical review of concepts and definitions.
- Larson, Brooke, Olivia Harris, and Enrique Tandeter. 1995. Ethnicity, markets, and migration in the Andes: at the crossroads of history and anthropology. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lastres, Helena M. M., and José Eduardo Cassiolato. 2005. "Innovation systems and local productive arrangements: new strategies to promote the generation, acquisition and diffusion of knowledge." *Innovation: management, policy & practice* no. 7 (2-3):172-187.
- Lauer, Mirko. 1976. Introducción a la pintura peruana del siglo XX. Lima: Mosca Azul Editores.
- . 1982. Crítica de la artesanía: Plástica y sociedad en los Andes peruanos. Lima: Desco.
- . 1989. La producción artesanal en América Latina. Lima, Peru: Mosca Azul Editores.
- Leiva, Fernando Ignacio. 1998. "Neoliberal and neostructuralist theories of competitiveness and flexible labor: The case of Chile's manufactured exports, 1973--1996."
- Lewis, Oscar. 1966. *La vida: a Puerto Rican family in the culture of poverty-San Juan and New York*. Vol. 13: Random House New York.
- . 1975. *Five families: Mexican case studies in the culture of poverty*: Basic Books.
- Li, Tania Murray. 2000. "Articulating indigenous identity in Indonesia: Resource politics and the tribal slot." *Comparative studies in society and history* no. 42 (01):149-179.
- . 2007. *The will to improve: governmentality, development, and the practice of politics*: Duke University Press.
- Liedholm, Carl. 2002. Small firm dynamics: evidence from Africa and Latin America. *Small Business Economics* 18(1):225-240.
- Lin, Chin-Huang, Chiu-Mei Tung, and Chih-Tai Huang. 2006. Elucidating the industrial cluster effect from a system dynamics perspective. *Technovation* 26(4):473-482.
- Little, Walter E. 2000. "Home as a place of exhibition and performance: Mayan household transformations in Guatemala." *Ethnology*:163-181.

- Littlefield, Alice, and Larry T Reynolds. 1990. The putting-out system: Transitional form or recurrent feature of capitalist production? *The Social Science Journal* 27(4):359-372.
- Littlefield, Alice. 1979. The expansion of capitalist relations of production in Mexican crafts. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 6(4):471-488.
- Long, Norman, and Ann Long. 1992. *Battlefields of knowledge : the interlocking of theory and practice in social research and development*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Long, Norman. 1975. "Structural dependency, modes of production and economic brokerage in rural Peru." *Beyond the Sociology of Development. Economy and Soc in Lat Am and Afr. I. Oxaal, T. Barnett & D. Booth, eds* no. 1975.
- . 2001. *Development sociology : actor perspectives*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Lowrey, Kathleen. 2008. "Incommensurability and new economic strategies among indigenous and traditional peoples." *Journal of Political Ecology* no. 15:61-74.
- Loza, Carmen Beatriz. 2008. "Alfareros del Imperio Huari. Vida Cotidiana y Áreas de Actividad en Conchopata." *Chungará (Arica)* no. 40 (2):235-237.
- Macera, Pablo. 1974. "El Perú antes y después de Ayacucho." *Dominical semanario de El Comercio. Lima* no. 8.
- . 1979. *Pintores populares andinos*: Fondo del Libro del Banco de los Andes.
- . 1982. LOS RETABLOS ANDINOS Y DON JOAQUÍN LÓPEZ ANTAY. *Boletín de Lima* (19-24).
- Magazine, Roger. 2011. "'We All Put on the Fiesta Together': Interdependence and the Production of Active Subjectivity through Cargos in a Highland Mexican Village." *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* no. 16 (2):296-314.
- Maiava, Susan L. 2001. *A Clash of Paradigms: Intervention, Response and Development in the South Pacific*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Manrique, Nelson. 1996. The Two Faces of Fujimori's Rural Policy. *NACLA Report on the Americas* 30:39-43.
- Marcus, George E., and Myers, Fred R. (Eds.). (1995). *The Traffic in Culture: Refiguring Art and Anthropology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Marshall, Alfred. 1919. *Industry and trade; a study of industrial technique and business organization*. London,: Macmillan and co., limited.
- Martin, Ron, and Peter Sunley. 2003 Deconstructing clusters: chaotic concept or policy panacea? *Journal of Economic Geography* 3(1):5-35.
- Martin, Ron. 2001. Geography and public policy: the case of the missing agenda. *Progress in Human Geography* 25(2):189-210.
- Maskell, Peter. 2001. Towards a Knowledge-based Theory of the Geographical Cluster. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 10(4):921-943.
- Matos Mar, José. 1986. *Desborde popular y crisis del estado : el nuevo rostro del Perú en la década de 1980*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Mayer, Enrique. 2002. *The articulated peasant: household economies in the Andes*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

- McClintock, Cynthia. 1989. Peru's Sendero Luminoso rebellion: origins and trajectory. Power and popular protest: Latin American social movements 342.
- McCormick, Gordon H. 1990. The Shining Path and the Future of Peru. DTIC Document.
- Meisch, Lynn. 2002. Andean entrepreneurs: Otavalo merchants and musicians in the global arena. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 2009. Tourism, the State, and the Marketing of Traditional Andean Artesanias: Problematic Encounters, Pitfalls, and Competing Interests. *In Cultural Tourism in Latin America: The Politics of Space & Imagery*. M. Baud and A. Ypeij, eds. Pp. 141-160.
- Mendizábal Losack, Emilio. 1958. Una contribucion al estudio del arte tradicional peruano. *Folklore Americano* 5:74-139.
- Mendoza, Román Robles. 2002. *Legislación peruana sobre comunidades campesinas*. Lima: UNMSM.
- Meyer-Stamer, Jörg. 1998. "Path dependence in regional development: persistence and change in three industrial clusters in Santa Catarina, Brazil." *World development* no. 26 (8):1495-1511.
- . 1999. From Industrial Policy to Regional and Local Locational Policy: Experience from Santa Catarina/Brazil. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 18(4):451-468.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. *Rule of experts: Egypt, techno-politics, modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2008. Rethinking economy. *Geoforum* 39(3):1116-1121.
- Mitchell, William P. 1972. The system of power in Quinua: a community of the Central Peruvian Highlands PhD, University of Pittsburgh.
- . 1976. "Irrigation and community in the central Peruvian highlands." *American Anthropologist* no. 78 (1):25-44.
- . 1976. Social adaptation to the mountain environment of an Andean village. Paper read at Hill lands: proceedings of an international symposium held at West Virginia University on October 3-9.
- . 1991. Peasants on the edge: crop, cult, and crisis in the Andes. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1997. "Pressures on Peasant Production and the Transformation of Regional and National Identities." *Migrants, regional Identities and Latin American Cities*.
- . 1999. Detour onto the Shining Path: Obscuring the Social Revolution in the Andes. *In Deadly Developments: Capitalism, States, and War*. S.P. Reyna and R.E. Downs, eds. Pp. 235-278. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach Publishers.
- . 2006. *Voices from the global margin: confronting poverty and inventing new lives in the Andes*. University of Texas Press.
- Mitchell, William P., and David Guillet. 1994. *Irrigation at high altitudes: the social organization of water control systems in the Andes*.
- Municipalidad Distrital de Quinua. (2001). *Balance Poblacional de la Municipalidad de Quinua*. Quinua, Peru.

- Murra, John V. 1972. *El "control vertical" de un máximo de pisos ecológicos en la economía de las sociedades andinas*: Universidad Hermilio Valdizán Huanuco.
- . 1975. *Formaciones económicas y políticas del mundo andino*: instituto de Estudios Peruanos Lima.
- . 1985. "El Archipiélago Vertical." *Revisited*. In *Andean Ecology and Civilization: An Interdisciplinary Perspective on Andean Ecological Complementarity*, edited by S. Masuda, I. Shimada, and C. Morris:3-13.
- . 1985. "The limits and limitations of the 'vertical archipelago' in the Andes." *Andean Ecology and Civilization: An Interdisciplinary Perspective on Andean Ecological Complementarity* (91):15.
- Nakatani, Ayami. 1999. "Eating threads": Brocades as cash crop for weaving mothers and daughters in Bali." *Staying local in the global village: Bali in the twentieth century*:203-229.
- Narotzky, Susana and Gavin Smith. 2006. *Immediate struggles people, power, and place in rural Spain*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Narotzky, Susana. 2004. The Political Economy of Affects: Community Friendship, and Family in the Organization of a Spanish Economic Region. In *Workers and Narratives of Survival in Europe*. A. Procoli, ed. Pp. 55-79. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- . 2007. The Project in the Model. *Current Anthropology* 48(3):403-424.
- . 2008. "Reply: What's changed (since 1975)?" *Dialectical Anthropology* no. 32 (1):9-16.
- Nash, June. 1993a. *Crafts in the world market: the impact of global exchange on Middle American artisans*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- . 1993b. "Introduction: Traditional Arts and Changing Markets in Middle America." In *Crafts in the world market: The impact of global exchange on Middle American artisans*, edited by June C. nash, 1-22. SUNY Press.
- . 1994. "Global integration and subsistence insecurity." *American Anthropologist* no. 96 (1):7-30.
- . 2000. Global integration and the commodification of culture. *Ethnology* 39(2):129-131.
- . 2001. *Mayan visions: the quest for autonomy in an age of globalization*. New York: Routledge.
- Navarro Ramos, Javier. 2005. Plan de Desarrollo Estratégico 2005 - 2010. edited by Municipalidad Distrital de Quinua. Quinua, Ayacucho, Peru.
- North, Douglass C. 1990. *Institutions, institutional change, and economic performance*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Novelo, Victoria. 1976. *Artesanías y capitalismo en México*. 1a ed. Tlalpan, D.F.: Centro de Investigaciones Superiores, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.
- O'Brien, Jay, and William Roseberry. 1991. *Golden ages, dark ages: imagining the past in anthropology and history*: University of California Pr.

- Oliva, Félix, and Luis Millones. 1986. Preservación y promoción del Patrimonio Artesanal. *In* Patrimonio cultural del Perú: balance y perspectivas. J.M. Ossio, ed. Pp. 93-123. Lima, Peru: FOMCIENCIAS.
- Ong, Aihwa. 2006. "Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty."
- Orlove, Benjamin S. 1977. "integration through production: the use of zonation in Espinar1." *American Ethnologist* no. 4 (1):84-101.
- . 1998. Down to Earth: Race and Substance in the Andes. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 17(2):207-222.
- Ortner, Sherry B. 1999. The fate of "culture": Geertz and beyond. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2006. Anthropology and social theory: Culture, power, and the acting subject: Duke University Press Books.
- Panfichi, Aldo. 1997 The Authoritarian Alternative: 'Anti-Politics' in the Popular Sectors of Lima. D. A: Chalmers et al.
- Panizza, Francisco. 2000. "Neopopulism and its limits in Collor's Brazil." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* no. 19 (2):177-192.
- Pastor, M., and C. Wise. 1992. Peruvian economic policy in the 1980s: From orthodoxy to heterodoxy and back. *Latin American Research Review* 27(2):83-117.
- Perú Posible. 2010. Plan de Gobierno Municipal de Distrito de Quinua 2011-2014. Quinua, Peru: Partido Político "Perú Posible".
- Phillips, Ruth B., and Steiner, Christopher Burghard. (1999). *Unpacking Culture: Art and Commodity in Colonial and Postcolonial Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pietrobelli, Carlo, and Roberta Rabellotti. 2006. Upgrading to Compete Global Value Chains, Clusters, and SMEs in Latin America: Harvard University Press.
- Pigg, Stacy Leigh. 1992. "Inventing social categories through place: Social representations and development in Nepal." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* no. 34 (3):491-513.
- . 1993. "Unintended consequences: the ideological impact of development in Nepal." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* no. 13 (1 and 2):45-58.
- . 1997. "Found in Most Traditional Societies." *Traditional Medical Practitioners between Culture and Development. In International Development and the Social Sciences, ed. F Cooper, R Packard:259-290.*
- Piore, Michael J., and Charles F. Sabel. 1984. The second industrial divide: possibilities for prosperity. New York: Basic Books.
- Poole, Deborah, and Gerardo Rénique. 1992 Peru: time of fear: Latin American Bureau London.
- Porter, Michael E. 1997. The Adam Smith address: location, clusters, and the "new" microeconomics of competition. *In* 39th Annual Meeting of National Association for Business Economics. New Orleans.
- . 1998a. Clusters and the New Economics of Competition. *Harvard Business Review* 76(6):77-90.

- . 1998b. *The competitive advantage of nations: with a new introduction*. New York: Free Press.
- . 2000. Attitudes, values, beliefs, and the microeconomics of prosperity. *Culture matters: How values shape human progress*:14-28.
- . 2010. *A Strategy for Sustaining Growth and Prosperity for Peru*. Institute for Strategy and Competitiveness Harvard Business School.
- Pozzi-Escot, Denise, M. Alarcón, and Cirilo Vivanco. 1993. "Instrumentos de alfareros de la época Wari." *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Études Andines* no. 22:467-496.
- Programa Conjunto. 2011. *Industrias Creativas Inclusivas: Una Herramienta Innovadora Para El Alivio De La Pobreza En El Perú*. Lima, Peru: Sistema De Las Naciones Unidas En El Perú, Gobierno De La República Del Perú.
- PromPerú. 2012. Quinoa, De mi tierra, Un producto. Retrieved August 6, 2012.
- Psacharopoulos, George, and Harry Anthony Patrinos. 1994. *Indigenous people and poverty in Latin America: an empirical analysis*: World bank.
- Pyke, Frank, and Werner Sengenberger. 1992. *Industrial districts and local economic regeneration*: International Labour Organisation.
- Pyke, Frank, Giacomo Becattini, and Werner Sengenberger. 1990. *Industrial districts and inter-firm co-operation in Italy*: International Institute for Labour Studies Geneva.
- Rahnema, Majid, and Victoria Bawtree. 1997. *The post-development reader*: Zed Books.
- Ramos, Joseph. 1998. "Una estrategia de desarrollo a partir de los complejos productivos (clusters) en torno a los recursos naturales." *Revista de la CEPAL* (66):4-125.
- Roel Mendizábal, Pedro. 2000. De Folklore a culturas híbridas: rescatando raíces, redefiniendo fronteras entre nos/otros. In *No hay país más diverso. Compendio de antropología peruana*. C.I. Degregori, ed. Pp. 74-122. Lima, Peru: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Rose, Nikolas. 1999. *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*: Cambridge university press.
- . 2000. Community, citizenship, and the third way. *American behavioral scientist* 43(9):1395-1411.
- Roseberry, William. 1989. *Anthropologies and histories: Essays in culture, history, and political economy*: Rutgers University Press.
- . 1991. "Potatoes, Sacks, and Enclosures in Early Modern England." In *Golden ages, dark ages: Imagining the past in anthropology and history*, edited by J. O'Brien and William Roseberry, 19-47. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2002. "Understanding Capitalism-Historically, Structurally, Spatially." In *Locating Capitalism in Time and Space: Global Restructurings Politics and Identity*, edited by David Nugent, 61-79. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rothstein, Frances Abrahamer. 2005. "Challenging Consumption Theory Production and Consumption in Central Mexico." *Critique of Anthropology* no. 25 (3):279-306.
- Rothstein, Frances, and Michael L. Blim. 1992. *Anthropology and the global factory: studies of the new industrialization in the late twentieth century*: Bergin & Garvey New York.

- Rowe, Ann P., and Lynn Meisch. 1998. *Costume and identity in highland Ecuador*. Washington, D.C.
- Rowe, William, and Vivian Schelling. 1991. *Memory and modernity: Popular culture in Latin America*: Verso Books.
- Sabel, Charles. 1989. Flexible Specialization and the re-emergence of regional economies. *In* Reversing industrial decline? Industrial Structure and policy in Britain and her competitors. P. Hirst and J. Zeitlin, eds. Oxford: Berg.
- Sabogal Wiese, José. 1978. "El campesino artesano en el Perú." *América* no. 207:218.
- Sabogal, José. 1956. *El Desván De La Imaginaria Peruana*. Lima, Peru: J. Mejía Baca & P.L. Villanueva.
- Sakakibara, Mariko, and Michael E. Porter. 2001. Competing at Home to Win Abroad: Evidence from Japanese Industry. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 83(2):310-322.
- Salomon, Frank. 1981 [1973]. *Weavers of Otavalo*: University of Illinois Press.
- . 2004. *The cord keepers: Khipus and cultural life in a Peruvian village*: Duke University Press.
- San Martin Baldwin, F. 1994. "Conglomerado de calzado en Trujillo-Peru: una nueva perspectiva de La pequeña empresa." *Peru: Fondo Editorial Pamis Copeme/Centro de Investigación, Estudio y Promoción del Desarrollo* Minka.
- Sandee, Henry, and Sandra Van Hulsen. 2000. Business Development Services for Small and Cottage Industry Clusters in Indonesia: A Review of Case Studies from Central Java. *In* International Conference "Business Services for Small Enterprises in Asia: Developing Markets and Measuring Performance." Hanoi.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1990. *The mobility of labor and capital: A study in international investment and labor flow*: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1991. "The Global City: New York." *London, Tokyo* no. 41.
- . 2002. "Locating cities on global circuits." *Environment and urbanization* no. 14 (1):13-30.
- Sawyer, Suzana. 2004 *Crude chronicles : indigenous politics, multinational oil, and neoliberalism in Ecuador*. Durham [N.C.]: Duke University Press.
- Schild, Veronica. 1998. "Market citizenship and the "new democracies": The ambiguous legacies of contemporary Chilean women's movements." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* no. 5 (2):232-249.
- . 2000. "Neo-liberalism's new gendered market citizens: The 'civilizing' dimension of social programmes in Chile." *Citizenship studies* no. 4 (3):275-305.
- Schmitz, Hubert. 1999. "From ascribed to earned trust in exporting clusters." *Journal of International Economics* no. 48 (1):139-150.
- . 2000. Does Local Co-operation Matter? Evidence from Industrial Clusters in South Asia and Latin America. *Oxford Development Studies* 28(3):323-336.
- Scott, Allen J. 1988. *New Industrial Spaces*. London: Pion.
- . 1997. The Cultural Economy of Cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 21(2):323-339.

- Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*: Yale university press.
- . 1998. *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*: Yale University Press.
- Seligmann, Linda J. 1995. *Between reform & revolution : political struggles in the Peruvian Andes, 1969-1991*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- . 1998. "Survival Politics and the Movements of Market Women in Peru in the Age of Neoliberalism." In *The Third Wave of Modernization in Latin America: Cultural Perspectives on Neoliberalism*, edited by Lynne Phillips, 65-82. Wilmington, DE: Jaguar Books on Latin America.
- . 2004. "Peruvian Street Lives." *Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press*.
- Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as freedom*. New York: Knopf.
- Shifter, Michael. 2004. "Breakdown in the Andes." *Foreign Aff.* no. 83:126.
- Sider, Gerald M. 1986. *Culture and class in anthropology and history: a Newfoundland illustration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sieder, Rachel. 2002. *Multiculturalism in Latin America*: Palgrave Macmillan Londres.
- Smart, Alan, and Josephine Smart. 2005. *Petty capitalists and globalization flexibility, entrepreneurship, and economic development*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Smith, Carol A. 1984a. "Does a commodity economy enrich the few while ruining the masses? Differentiation among petty commodity producers in guatemala 1." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* no. 11 (3):60-95.
- . 1984b. "Local history in global context: Social and economic transitions in Western Guatemala." *Comparative studies in society and history* no. 26 (02):193-228.
- Smith, Gavin, and Susana Narotzky. 2005. *Movers and Fixers: Historical Forma of Exploitation and the marketing of a Regional Economy in Spain*. In *Petty Capitalists and Globalization: Flexibility, Entrepreneurship and Economic Development*. A. Smart and J. Smart, eds. Pp. 45-66. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Smith, Gavin. 1979. *Socio-economic differentiation and relations of production among rural-based petty producers in central Peru, 1880 to 1970*. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 6(3):286-310.
- . 1989. *Livelihood and resistance: Peasants and the politics of land in Peru*: University of California Pr.
- . 1991. *The Production of Culture in Local Rebellion*. In *Golden Ages, Dark Ages: Imagining the past in anthropology and history*. J. O'brien and W. Roseberry, eds. Pp. 180-207. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1999. *Confronting the present : towards a politically engaged anthropology*. Oxford ; New York: Berg.
- . 1999. *Confronting the present: towards a politically engaged anthropology*: Berg.

- . 2002. Out of Site: The Horizons of Collective Identity. In *Culture, economy, power: anthropology as critique, anthropology as praxis*. W. Lem and B. Leach, eds. Albany: State University of New York Press
- Sökefeld, Martin. 1999. "Debating self, identity, and culture in anthropology." *Current anthropology* no. 40 (4):417-448.
- Solfrini, Giuseppe. 2001. "The Peruvian Labor Movement Under Authoritarian Neoliberalism: From Decline to Demise." *International Journal of Political Economy* no. 31 (2):44-77.
- Soriano Giraldo, César. 2011 *Estrategia para el desarrollo de negocios inclusivos en el sector artesanal*. Lima, Peru: AIDCA Perú.
- Stern, Orin. 2005. *The Peru Reader*.
- . 1994. "Rethinking the Politics of Anthropology: The Case of the Andes [and Comments and Reply]." *Current Anthropology* no. 35 (1):13-38.
- Stastny, Francisco. (1968). *La artesanía del Perú y sus orígenes*. Madrid, Spain: Fundacion del Banco Continental para el Fomento de la Educacion y la Cultura
- Stephen, Lynn. 1991. Culture as a Resource: Four Cases of Self-Managed Indigenous Craft Production in Latin America. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 40:101-130.
- . 2005. Women's Weaving Cooperatives in Oaxaca. *Critique of Anthropology* 25(3):253-278.
- Stern, Steve J. 1982. "Peru's indian peoples and the challenge of Spanish conquest: Huamanga to 1640."
- . 1998. *Shining and other paths: war and society in Peru, 1980-1995*. Durham [NC]: Duke University Press.
- Storper, Michael, and Allen John Scott. 1992. *Pathways to industrialization and regional development*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Storper, Michael, and Anthony J. Venables. 2004. Buzz: face-to-face contact and the urban economy. *Journal of Economic Geography* 4(4):351-370.
- Storper, Michael. 1995. The Resurgence of Regional Economies, Ten Years Later. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 2(3):191-221.
- Strathern, Marilyn. 1988. "The Gender of the Gift." *Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia*.
- Sun, Chia-Chi, Grace T. R. Lin, and Gwo-Hshiung Tzeng. 2009. The evaluation of cluster policy by fuzzy MCDM: Empirical evidence from HsinChu Science Park. *Expert Systems with Applications* 36(9):11895-11906.
- Swartz, David. 1997. *Culture & power: the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, Charles. 1992. *The Ethics of Authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 1989. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Harvard University Press.
- . 1991. *The ethics of authenticity*. Vol. 30: Cambridge Univ Press.
- . 2002. "Modern social imaginaries." *Public culture* no. 14 (1):91-124.

- Thomas, Kedron. 2011. "Spaces of Structural Adjustment in Guatemala's Apparel Industry." *Securing the City: Neoliberalism, Space, and Insecurity in Postwar Guatemala*:147.
- . 2012. "Intellectual Property Law and the Ethics of Imitation in Guatemala." *Anthropological Quarterly* no. 85 (3):785-815.
- Thompson, Edward Palmer. 1968. *The making of the English working class*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Tice, Karin E. 1995. *Kuna crafts, gender, and the global economy*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Tschopik, Harry. 1947. *Highland communities of Central Peru: a regional survey*. Volume 5. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. 2011. *Friction: An ethnography of global connection*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tulchin, Joseph S, and Gary Bland. 1994. *Peru in Crisis: Dictatorship Or Democracy?*: L. Rienner Publishers.
- Tura, Tomi, and Vesa Harmaakorpi. 2005. Social capital in building regional innovative capability. *Regional Studies* 39(8):1111-1125.
- Ulfe, María Eugenia. 2009. Representaciones del (y lo) indígena en los retablos peruanos. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Études Andines* 38(2):307-326.
- UNCTAD, UNDP, UNESCO, WIPO, and ITC. 2008. *Creative Economy Report: The challenge of assessing the creative economy towards informed policy-making*. New York: United Nations.
- UNESCO. 1998. *World Culture Report 1998: Culture, Creativity and Markets*. Paris: UNESCO.
- . 2012. *Crafts and Design, Building confidence: crafts for development*, Vol. 2013.
- Urrutia, Jaime. 1983. "De las rutas, ferias y circuitos en Huamanga." *Allpanchis* no. 21:47-64.
- Valdez, Lidio M. 1990. *Trueque y articulación económica campesina en Huanta*: Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología.
- . 1997. "Ecology and ceramic production in an Andean community: a reconsideration of the evidence." *Journal of Anthropological Research*:65-85.
- . 2012. "Y la tradición continúa: la alfarería de la época inka en el valle de Ayacucho, Perú." *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* (6):395-410.
- Van Hulsén, Sandra. 2005. How SMEs benefit from industrial clustering in Peru: A case study from the metalworking sector. In APEC symposium "Industrial Clustering for SMEs". Chinese Taipei.
- Van Leeuwen, Theo. 2008. *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*: Oxford University Press.
- Van Vleet, Krista E. 2008. *Performing kinship : narrative, gender, and the intimacies of power in the Andes*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Veltmeyer, Henry. 2008. *New perspectives on globalization and antiglobalization: prospects for a new world order?*: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Vergara, Abilio, J. Arguedas, and G. Zaga. 1983. "Reciprocidad y Ciclos Productivos en la

- Comunidad de Culluchaca." *Ayacucho, Peril: Instituto de Estudios Regionales Josei Maria Arguedas*.
- Vidaurreazaga, Madeleine Burns. 2009. Artesanía una alternativa de crecimiento y Desarrollo Económico. Lima, Peru: MINCETUR, PromoArtesania 2009.
- Villarán, Fernando. 1998. Riqueza popular: pasión y gloria de la pequeña empresa, 1998. Ediciones del Congreso del Perú.
- . 2000. Las PYMEs en la estructura empresarial peruana. S.p.e. Desarrollo, ed. Lima: SASE.
- Vincent, Susan. 2004. "Participation, resistance and problems with the 'local' in Peru: towards a new political contract?" In *Participation--From Tyranny to Transformation?: Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development*, edited by Samuel Hickey and Giles Mohan, 111-124. New York: Zed Books.
- . 2012. *Dimensions of Development: History, Community, and Change in Allpachico, Peru*. Vol. 38: University of Toronto Press.
- Visser, Evert-Jan. 1996. Local sources of competitiveness: spatial clustering and organisational dynamics in small-scale clothing in Lima, Peru PhD, University of Amsterdam.
- . 1999. A Comparison of Clustered and Dispersed Firms in the Small-Scale Clothing Industry of Lima. *World Development* 27(9):1553-1570.
- Wade, Peter. 1997. Race and ethnicity in Latin America. Pluto Press.
- Watanabe, John M. 1992. *Maya saints and souls in a changing world*: U of Texas Press.
- Waterbury, Ronald. 1989. "Embroidery for tourists: A contemporary putting-out system in Oaxaca, Mexico." *Cloth and human experience*:243-271.
- Weismantel, Mary. 2006. "Ayllu: real and imagined communities in the Andes." *The seductions of community: emancipations, oppressions, quandaries*:77-100.
- Wibbelsman, Michelle. 2005. "Otavaleños at the Crossroads: Physical and Metaphysical Coordinates of an Indigenous World." *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* no. 10 (1):151-185.
- Wiese, José R. Sabogal. 1979. *Arte vernáculo en Huamanga:(testimonio de 3 artesanos)*: Centro de Investigaciones Socio-Económicas (CISE), Taller de Coyuntura Agraria, Universidad Nacional Agraria.
- Wilkinson-Weber, Clare M. 1997. "Skill, dependency, and differentiation: Artisans and agents in the Lucknow embroidery industry." *Ethnology*:49-65.
- Williams, Raymond. 1979. *Politics and Letters*. New York: Verso.
- . 1985 [1976]. *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1989. *Resources of hope: Culture, democracy, socialism*. London: Verso.
- Williamson, John. 1990. *The progress of policy reform in Latin America*. Vol. 28: Peterson Institute.
- Winn, Peter, ed. 2004. *Victims of the Chilean miracle: Workers and neoliberalism in the Pinochet era, 1973–2002*: Duke University Press.

- Wolf, Eric R. 2010 [1982]. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wood, David. 2000. Crafts. In *Encyclopedia of contemporary Latin American and Caribbean cultures*. D. Balderston, M. Gonzalez, and A.M. López, eds. Pp. 434-37. New York: Routledge.
- . 2005. *De sabor nacional: El impacto de la cultura popular en el Perú*. Lima, Peru: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Banco Central de Reserva del Perú.
- World-Bank. 2011. Business Development Support Services for Micro/SMEs. Pro-Poor Market Development. World Bank. <http://go.worldbank.org/2MM434GIK0> 15 February 2011.
- Yashar, Deborah J. 2005. *Contesting citizenship in Latin America : the rise of indigenous movements and the postliberal challenge*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Yúdice, George. 2002. *El recurso de la cultura*: Gedisa Barcelona.
- . 2003. *The expediency of culture: uses of culture in the global era*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Zermeño, Sergio. 1989. "El regreso del líder: crisis, neoliberalismo y desorden." *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*:115-150.
- Ziai, Aram, ed. 2007. *Exploring Post-development: Theory and Practices, Problems and Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Zorn, Elayne. 2004. *Weaving a future: tourism, cloth & culture on an Andean island*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.